

Oct 11 213

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE  
**LUTHERAN QUARTERLY**

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. LI—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, 1921.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1921

## CONTENTS

<b>I. The Social and Political Theories of J. H. W. Stuckenberg</b>	389
By Harry Elmer Barnes, Ph.D.	
<b>II. The Apostolic Age and Writings Considered With Reference to Some Recent Criticisms</b>	403
By Professor J. M. Hantz	
<b>III. Religion in Every Day Life</b>	417
By Rev. George E. Bowersox	
<b>IV. The Union Movements Between Lutheran and Reformed in America</b>	427
By Professor J. L. Neve	
<b>V. Current Theological Thought</b>	456
English. By Professor J. A. Singmaster	
German. By Professor J. L. Neve	
<b>VI. Review of Recent Literature</b>	472
<p><b>Apologetics.</b>—Modernism and the Christian Faith—What Christian Science Means and What We Can Learn from It—What and Where Is God. <b>Exegesis.</b>—The Pastoral Epistles—Christianity According to St. Luke. <b>History.</b>—Erasmus and Luther—The Beginnings of Christianity—The Religions of Mankind—The World's Student Christian Federation, Origin, Achievements, Forecast. <b>New Testament.</b>—Jesus and Paul—The Four Gospels. <b>Philosophy.</b>—Bergson and Personal Realism. <b>Practical Theology.</b>—Paul's Companions—Citizenship and Moral Reform—Sermons on the Lord's Prayer—What Christianity Means to Me—Followers of the Marked Trail—The Call to Unity—"This Way"—Realizing Religion—The Ethopic Didascalia. <b>Systematic Theology.</b>—Christianity in its Modern Expression. <b>Missions.</b>—Training World Christians. <b>Sunday School.</b>—A New Way to Solve Old Problems. <b>Bible Studies and Archaeology.</b>—The Geography of Bible Lands—The Pilgrim in Jerusalem—Short Egyptian Grammar—King Alfred Books—The Prophetic Movement in Israel. <b>Miscellaneous.</b>—The Lutheran World Almanac and Annual Encyclopedia for 1921—Lincoln and Prohibition.</p>	

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1921.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THEORIES OF J. H. W. STUCKENBERG

A Representative Sociological Contribution to Politics.

BY HARRY ELMER BARNES, PH.D.

Professor of History, Clark University.

#### I. General Nature of His Sociological Writings.

Among the American writers on sociology who were not at the same time university teachers of the subject, Lester F. Ward was easily first in importance.<sup>1</sup> There is no doubt that second place should be assigned to J. H. W. Stuckenberg.<sup>2</sup> Both Ward and Stuckenberg suffered unmerited obscurity owing to their lack of association with university circles. Ward, however, became well-known in later years, especially after his entrance into professional ranks. Stuckenberg, on the other hand, has remained more obscure among academicians.

Stuckenberg was born in Hanover, Germany, in 1835.

<sup>1</sup> Ward's important sociological writings had all been published before he went to Brown in 1906.

<sup>2</sup> John Henry Wilburn Stuckenberg (1835-1903).

He came to this country as a youth but returned to Germany to complete his education. He was Professor of Philosophy in Wittenberg College until 1880, when he went to Berlin as pastor of the American Chapel. Returning to America in 1894, he devoted the remaining years of his life to his sociological writings. His *Introduction to the Study of Sociology* appeared in 1898, and his larger work, *Sociology, the Science of Human Society*, was published in two volumes in 1903, the year of his death.

Stuckenberg's works are characterized by a considerable amount of erudition and mental vigor and a wholesome degree of common-sense and freedom from technicalities. His works stand at the opposite pole from Ward's in many respects. He evidences little of Ward's grasp of natural science, and his work presents none of those forbidding and often semi-barbarous technical terms with which Ward's *Pure Sociology* bristles. Another distinctive characteristic of Stuckenberg's work is the extensive acquaintance with German sociological and political literature which came from his prolonged residence in Germany. The chief criticisms which can be directed against Stuckenberg's work are the proneness to diffuseness and the lack of careful discrimination in his material and his bibliographical references, in short, the faults common to writers whose methods have not been developed in the disciplinary competition of academic life.

Stuckenberg's first sociological treatise, *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, consists chiefly of prolegomena to sociology, such as its nature, scope, province, relationships, and methodology. Aside from a lack of critical discrimination in bibliographical details, the work is one of the best treatments of these rather overworked subjects.<sup>3</sup>

His systematic treatment of social science is embodied in his *Sociology*. After briefly surveying a part of the

3 It is well reviewed by Professor Small, *American Journal Sociology*, May 1898, pp. 855-9.

ground covered by his earlier volume on the nature and province of sociology, Stuckenberg treats in logical sequence the *nature of society*, including an analysis of the social forces; *social evolution*, with its three stages of the consanguine, the political, and the international eras; and *sociological ethics*, or the social ideal and the means of reaching it. He sums up his view of his sociological system in the following paragraph:

"Our purpose throughout has been to make the interpretation scientific, systematic. Three fundamental and comprehensive problems we found to be involved in this purpose: the inherent nature of society; the manifestation of this nature in the process of development; and what, taking all the social data into account, society ought to become. By omitting either the Nature of Society, Social Evolution, or Sociological Ethics, numerous weighty questions remain unanswered; but in these three divisions, of which each occupies a realm peculiar to itself, a place is found for every legitimate inquiry respecting the science of society."<sup>4</sup>

The only theoretical innovation of any importance which Stuckenberg contributes is the concept of *sociation*. This term is introduced in the attempt to clarify the relation between the individual and society, and the nature of association. Men cannot be bodily united in society; neither do their minds coalesce. The individual personality remains and is distinct from the social personality. "This is only another way of saying what was said before, that society does not consist, strictly speaking, of individuals, but only of so much of them as is associated."<sup>5</sup> Stuckenberg invents the term *sociation* to describe this relation between associated individuals. He defines this term as follows:

"We use it to designate those personal forces which interact between men; to indicate what men share, what associates. It stands for all that makes society as distinguished from the sum of individuals. Sociation thus

4 Sociology, Vol. II, p. 292.

5 Introduction to the Study of Sociology, pp. 126-7.

gives the essence of society and differentiates it from all other objects."<sup>6</sup>

The value of this new bit of terminology will be differently appraised by writers according to their views upon social psychology. Professor Cooley has argued at considerable length that the whole attempt to distinguish between society and the individual as separate entities is based upon false psychological premises.<sup>7</sup>

## II. Specific Contributions to Political Theory.

### 1. Fundamental Concepts and Definitions.

Stuckenberg's distinction between sociology and political science is clear and definite. Sociology is the science of human association in its most general and comprehensive sense. "The subject-matter of sociology is thus made definite—every kind of human association."<sup>8</sup> "The science of politics," on the other hand, "confines itself to the state, explaining its structure and functions, marking the peculiarity of its organization as distinguished from other societies, treating of the relations of the citizens to one another and to the state, and of the government to the governed, the constitution and laws, and all that belongs to the domain of national life."<sup>9</sup> Sociology also studies the state, but from a different standpoint than political science. It does not center its attention upon the inner organization and functioning of the state, but rather concentrates upon the relation of the state to society in general. "The sociological view considers the place of the State in social evolution and the general influence of the State on human association."<sup>10</sup>

Sociology, is not, however, merely the sum or synthesis of the special social sciences. It is the elemental social science which furnishes the logical foundation for the

6 Ibid. p. 127.

7 Cf. his "Human Nature and the Social Order," pp. 1-2, and passim; and "Social Organization," Chaps. i-ii.

8 "Introduction to the Study of Sociology," p. 52.

9 Ibid. p. 80.

10 "Sociology," II, p. 65.

more detailed and specialized work of the particular social sciences. "Sociology is therefore the general social science of which the special social sciences are differentiations; it is the genus of which they are the species, the trunk on which they are the branches."<sup>11</sup> Or, again, "the relation of sociology to the special social sciences is similar to that of science to the sciences, of philosophy to the philosophies, of history to the histories, of language to the languages, of literature to the literatures, and of art to the arts."<sup>12</sup>

Stuckenberg distinguishes clearly between the concepts state and society. Society is a group of individuals in a process of psychic interaction and interstimulation.<sup>13</sup> The state is the sovereign organization of society.<sup>14</sup> "The State is the authority of the collectivity, whether that authority be seated in one man as a despot, in a chosen few as noblemen or aristocrats, in the male citizens, or in all the inhabitants of a given age."<sup>15</sup>

Stuckenberg's differentiation between the state and the government is equally definite:

"In idea the State and its government are distinct; but the Government, including the legislative and judicial, as well as the executive, functions, is the political actuality which makes itself visible and felt. . . . We can say that the State is the sovereign power in the form of a political organization. The Government is the organ of the State for the realization in actual life of the inherent sovereignty."<sup>16</sup>

"The Government is not the State, but only its direct-

11 "Introduction to the Study of Sociology," p. 77.

12 "Sociology," Vol. I, p. 41. Stuckenberg's discussion of the relation of sociology to political science is one of the most effective answers in print to those archaic political scientists who would make their subject the fundamental and all-inclusive social science. Cf. "Introduction to the Study of Sociology," pp. 78-83; "Sociology," Vol. I, pp. 17-21.

13 "Sociology," Vol. I, pp. 80-81, 86.

14 Ibid. II, pp. 85-7; "Introduction to the Study of Sociology," p. 81.

15 "Introduction to the Study of Sociology," p. 81. Cf. "Sociology," I, p. 214.

16 "Sociology," II, pp. 88-9.

ive or executive function, the organ through which the state expresses itself. Governments change while the State continues to exist. The State is the concentrated political force of the totality, which force is expressed by the legislative, judicial, and executive powers."<sup>17</sup>

In discussing the relation between the state and the nation, Stuckenberg lapses into a strange inconsistency and lack of scientific discrimination by referring to the United States as a nation composed of a number of separate states. His general treatment of the subject makes it plain, however, that he regards the nation as identical with the sovereign state.<sup>18</sup>

Stuckenberg agrees with the generally accepted position of political science that territory, population, sovereign power, and governmental organization are the vital attributes of the state.<sup>19</sup> He protests, however, against the views of writers like Ratzel and Morgan who over-emphasize the territorial basis of the state, and hold that territory and property are the essential characteristics of the political state which mark it off from the previous stage of consanguine organization. Stuckenberg maintains that it is the peculiar relation of the sovereign political authority to the inhabitants, rather than the territorial basis, which is the vital criterion of the existence of a state. "The essence of the State is the citizenship, the relation and functions of the inhabitants. The state can be understood only as a truly human and social institution, with man in his varied relations, not property as the central idea."<sup>20</sup>

## 2. The Origins of Political Institutions.

In his theory of the origin of the state Stuckenberg follows the doctrines of Morgan and Hearn, namely that the state was a development from the consanguine or

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. pp. 85-6.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. II, pp. 86, 123-4.

<sup>19</sup> "Introduction to the Study of Sociology," p. 81, "Sociology, I, pp. 213-16, II, pp. 74-5, 85-7.

<sup>20</sup> "Sociology, II, pp. 74-6.

kinship stage of society, through a gradual process in which the growing complexity of economic interests and social relations had rendered the kinship basis of society inadequate and obstructive. While he is acquainted with Ratzenhofer and Gumplowicz, he strangely makes no use of their theories regarding the origin of the state.

Stuckenberg sketches three broad stages of social evolution, the *consanguine*, the *political* or the period of the national state, and the *international*.<sup>21</sup>

The consanguine period was that in which the foundations were laid for all future development<sup>22</sup> and in which government originated in the family. Stuckenberg's summary of the contributions of the pre-political period is one of the best in sociological literature:

"With all its disadvantages, that first era has the honour of being the pioneer of the entire course of humanity. The mind we call, probably contemptuously, savage or barbarian, furnished mankind with spoken, and perhaps written language, certainly among the most marvellous achievements of the race. That first era also evolved racial characteristics which were permanent, but not necessarily final; it developed hunters and fishers; taught men the use of nature and how to make tools; developed pastoral and agricultural life and learned the value of metals; it established important relations among men, founded the family, instituted tribal government and still larger governmental institutions, and was rich in associations from which higher organizations could be evolved; it began art, formulated ethical rules, made religion of some kind universal, and laid a basis for intellectual development. Besides laying a foundation, it left to the second era a vast amount of material with which to build a suitable structure for the growing needs."<sup>23</sup>

Stuckenberg holds that we cannot tell exactly when or how political organization in the form of the state arose, but maintains that we can be certain regard-

21 "Sociology," II, pp. 3-4, and 3-194, *passim*.

22 *Ibid.* I, pp. 308-10.

23 "Sociology," II, pp. 118-119.

ing the conditions which made its appearance inevitable. These conditions "involved the development of industries, the growth of trade, the mingling, through commerce and otherwise, of peoples of different blood, the establishment of cities where strangers located and formed a community, and the increase of human and social relationships, which physiological connection does not account for."<sup>24</sup> Cities were probably the nuclei of the first states, as they supplied in the highest degree these conditions which created the necessity for a new type of political organization.<sup>25</sup>

The transition from the consanguine to the political type of social evolution was a long and gradual process with numerous intermediate stages, but it was one of the greatest advances in social evolution.<sup>26</sup>

"The transition, though gradual and imperceptible, involved one of the greatest principiant changes in history, a change during which men passed from what nature has instituted biologically to what their developed minds, enlarged personal interests, and the totality of their social relations required."<sup>27</sup>

A theocratic type of organization may have intervened between the consanguine and the political stages in some instances, as was the case with the Hebrews.<sup>28</sup>

In view of the fact that the mass of the people are always conservative, the definite institution of the state was probably due "to a few leaders or men in authority, who recognized the new needs and made provision to meet them."<sup>29</sup>

When the new political era was inaugurated, the principle of consanguinity was limited and not extinguished. It was usually accorded recognition and awarded certain privileges in the new order and lingered for centuries.<sup>30</sup>

24 Ibid. p. 66.

25 Ibid. p. 69.

26 Ibid. p. 67.

27 Ibid. pp. 67-8.

28 Ibid. pp. 69-70.

29 Ibid. p. 68. Cf. Professor Gidding's theory of "protocracy" in his "Responsible State," pp. 17-20.

30 Stuckenberg, op. cit. Vol. II, pp. 71 ff.

While the territorial basis of the state is very important, the central feature of the state is the principle of citizenship, which is a broader and higher type of relationship, than is provided in the consanguine period.

"Citizenship involves a vast range of relations and interests which could not be provided for in the preceding era. Law substitutes a rule of general application for individual whim, caprice, and passion; it sets up an impartial, impersonal, and universal standard in place of personal prejudice and malice. The State puts a judicial tribunal where formerly blood-feud prevailed. Tradition and custom no longer suffice, because new relations have been entered and new cases for adjudication arise. The State as a law-making and law-executing sovereignty applies rational tests to human relations and actions, instead of letting them be determined by biology. Its laws reveal the State as a higher psychical stage of evolution."<sup>31</sup>

The national state, however, cannot be regarded as the final goal of political evolution. The increased contact of citizens of different states and the growth of international interests and relationships in every sphere have created the need for an international type of political organization.<sup>32</sup>

"Therefore, we affirm that just as, in the first era, evolution led beyond the family organization as final, so now evolution is leading beyond the State as final. Practically, in the intercourse of States, the second era has already been superseded. The State is not the ultimate form of organization, but a step that leads to something beyond. Statesmen as well as sociologists and other investigators seize the idea of the family of nations and seek to determine what relations and actions are involved in this idea. Not at once can this idea be realized; but every deeper view of the political trend points to a more comprehensive organization than the State as ultimate."<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Ibid. p. 78.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid. pp. 128-9, 151.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid. p. 129.

### 3. Forms of the State and the Government.

Stuckenberg makes no formal attempt to classify or describe the different types of states and governments. He merely discusses in a general way the underlying principles and salient characteristics of republican and monarchical government. The true basis of republican or popular government is not the fallacious notion that the people ought to govern because they best understand their own interests, but rather their undoubted right to manage their own affairs. The monarchical theory of government is that the people are not competent to govern themselves, but must be governed from above. These two different views mark the opposite extremes of political theory and practice, between which there are many possible gradations of either type.<sup>34</sup>

One of the greatest mistakes in political theory is the common belief that the people have a native or inherent ability for self-government, whereas, in reality, successful popular government can only be the result of a long period of gradual development and training. Most of the defects of contemporary popular government are those which are inherent in imperfectly developed institutions. The chief faults of popular government, in its present stage of development, are the difficulties involved in obtaining specialists in the government and in securing united and intelligent action in emergencies. Probably most of these defects will be eliminated by further political development. The main hope for the future perfection of popular political institutions lies in the education, particularly the political education, of the citizens.<sup>35</sup>

### 4. Political Sovereignty and its Limitations.

"Sovereignty," says Stuckenberg, "means supreme power from which there is no appeal." "Whether the

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. p. 102.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid. pp. 101-3.

sovereignty be regarded as inherent in the people or as hovering over them, its unconditional authority is regarded as axiomatic—a sovereignty which recognizes no appeal outside of and beyond itself.”<sup>36</sup> Sovereignty is an indispensable attribute of the independent state.<sup>37</sup>

Stuckenberg, however, freely admits the difficulties involved in this conception of absolute sovereignty when it is applied to the cases of dependencies, protectorates, and spheres of influence, and especially when extended to the relations between unquestionably independent sovereign states.<sup>38</sup> He admits with extreme frankness that this view of sovereignty breaks down when applied to foreign relations, whatever may be its validity in regard to domestic or internal affairs. “Sovereignty in foreign affairs is a myth with which fools try to deceive each other.”<sup>39</sup> “The sovereignty of the State received an application in former times which must be abandoned now. The State was regarded as in all respects the final appeal, in external as well as in internal affairs. . . . This kind of sovereignty has proved itself untenable; it is illogical. If ten States are equally sovereign, then none of them is sovereign. If one State can determine its relation to other States, then all with an equal sovereignty must have the same right. International affairs are, therefore, in a state of chaos.”<sup>40</sup> Stuckenberg’s solution of this problem of reconciling sovereignty and international relations is to demand recognition of the sovereign authority of an international court of arbitration for the decision of international disputes. This is based upon the conception “that there are spheres in which no state is sovereign, but that in these the sovereignty resides in several States, or is international.”<sup>41</sup> The sovereignty of the state, which is conferred by the people, applies only to internal affairs. “Outside of this all sovereignty

36 Ibid. I, p. 214.

37 Ibid. II, p. 85; “Introduction to the Study of Sociology,” p. 81.

38 “Sociology,” II, pp. 86, 124 ff., 127.

39 Ibid. p. 127.

40 Ibid. pp. 124-5.

41 Ibid. p. 170.

is a usurpation which is perpetuated by traditionalism, by fictions, and by might."<sup>42</sup>

#### 5. The Functions of the State.

In treating the important question of the legitimate scope of state-activity, Stuckenberg advances the preliminary proposition that it is impossible to make any sweeping generalizations upon this point, except of the most general kind. The proper functions of the State vary with the stage of social evolution and general enlightenment, and, hence, will be different in different periods and regions. One must always, therefore, assume the historical and comparative viewpoint in dogmatizing upon this question.<sup>43</sup> Stuckenberg maintains, however, that one is safe in making the generalization that in any period of political or social development the State could control and administer all matters which pertain to the general or public welfare of the group and cannot be adequately dealt with by private or voluntary organizations. "Here we come to the function of the State. If it fails to attend to the interests which lie beyond the function of a particular society yet are common to all the societies and necessary for their welfare, it abdicates its authority. On the other hand, it leaves its special sphere and becomes a usurper if it assumes the functions of the particular societies and dictates terms which belong to the freedom of these societies."<sup>44</sup> "The State as an embodiment of the political force of the totality ought to organize and control whatever pertains to the public welfare of the community."<sup>45</sup>

The general rule that the State should follow in its relation to voluntary private organizations is to lay down those general laws which shall govern the activities and relations of these organizations, in so far as they directly affect the public interest, and leave them to their own

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. pp. 80, 82, 120.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid. pp. 80-81.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. p. 92.

initiative within these limitations which are imposed for the general good of the community.<sup>46</sup> Under no consideration should the State attempt to control the thought as well as the actions of its citizens.<sup>47</sup>

Political institutions in the past "have been chiefly restraining, coercive and punitive forces." In the future their functions will include in an increasing degree the reformation, improvement, and exaltation of the people.<sup>48</sup> In general, however, the State has been, and is likely to continue to be, the indispensable condition to progress rather than the direct cause or chief instrument of advancement. Its protective and regulative functions allow voluntary organizations "to develop their resources and make the most of their opportunities."<sup>49</sup>

While it is impossible to make any specific prediction as to the future of state-activity, it is reasonably certain that as intelligence increases and the people become better trained in self-control, the control of social activities by the State will become more general and will allow a larger degree of freedom to individual initiative. "As the citizens grow in the ability of self-government, the State will increasingly confine its attention to the general interests of the public. The largeness of the political interests, being commensurate with the extent of human concerns, makes it impossible to forecast the future functions of the State.<sup>50</sup> In any event the improvement of political institutions in the future must depend primarily upon the education of the citizens in statecraft, and upon the general improvement in intelligence.<sup>51</sup>

The allied problem of the reconciliation of state authority with liberty, Stuckenberg dismisses with the pertinent observation that real liberty is only to be obtained through the protection afforded by the State, and that liberty is increased in proportion as political life passes

46 Ibid. pp. 80, 104-5.

47 Ibid. p. 81.

48 Ibid. p. 98.

49 Ibid. p. 94.

50 Ibid. p. 120.

51 Ibid. pp. 103, 105-6, 272-3.

from anarchy to stable and efficient organization<sup>52</sup> Again, the State promotes the growth of individuation to a far greater degree than the consanguine social organization, thus being favorable to both liberty and individuation.<sup>53</sup>

#### 6. The State and International Relations.

Stuckenberg's views in regard to the function of the State with respect to foreign relations have been touched upon in analyzing his opinions with respect to the final stage of political evolution, and the problem of the relation of sovereignty and international interests. He is one of the most ardent advocates among sociological writers of an adequate development of international political machinery, so as to be able to put an end to the anarchical and chaotic condition of international relations. In every aspect, except political organization, social relations have become international in scope.

"Everywhere narrow political limits are being burst. In that great trend towards enlarged combinations only the States are behind, each preferring to nourish its own interests and in the larger affairs engage in destructive rivalry and conflict. Capitalism has international organizations in the form of syndicates and trusts. Labour is forming leagues regardless of nationalities; and both socialism and anarchism have international affinities and unions. Religion transcends State bounds and makes the world its kingdom. Learning is rapidly becoming cosmopolitan, the boundlessness of truth being its only limit. A university or academy of science fails in its calling if its influence is not international. Ethics, like religion, makes humanity its sphere."<sup>54</sup>

Humanity and not the state is regarded as ultimate by sociology.<sup>55</sup> The first step towards the development of internationalism in political organization must be the

<sup>52</sup> Ibid. pp. 85, 92.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid. pp. 83-4.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid. p. 151.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid. pp. 148-9.

further development of international law and the practice of international arbitration in matters which involve the interests of more than one state.<sup>56</sup> The ultimate stage in political evolution will probably be a federation of nations. "This seems to be the natural course of evolution: first, a federation of nations having most in common; then, a federation of all the nations which have relations which require regulation; finally, a federation of all the States of the world."<sup>57</sup>

#### 7. Extra-legal Phases of Political Control.

Stuckenberg emphasizes the importance of the non-political organs of social control. "Besides the effects wrought by the laws of the State, other processes are at work to settle social affairs, particularly in the large spheres not under political control. Tradition and custom prevail, though they have less power than in the first or consanguine era. Public opinion, churches, schools, voluntary associations, often determine the course of the people and may affect the State and its laws. Society changes much or little, according as the social or non-political institutions are mobile or fixed."<sup>58</sup> Not only do these non-political institutions determine the general trend and rapidity of social evolution, but they also influence political organization and development. "In free States, and even in others, the non-political societies can make moral progress in principle and practice, and become a leaven of the whole citizenship, and eventually determine the political course."<sup>59</sup> It is the prime problem of political theory and practical statesmanship to arrive at the most perfect adjustment between the political and non-political types of organization, so as to secure the maximum degree of initiative and progress in the realm of voluntary activity, and at the same time protect the

<sup>56</sup> Ibid. pp. 148, 156, 158.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid. p. 183. Stuckenberg's complete treatment of international relations is found in pp. 135-194.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid. p. 93. Cf. 105.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid. p. 113.

public against exploitation.<sup>60</sup> But the greatest danger from exploitation is to be found in political parties, which put their interests above the public welfare, though, in the last analysis, in a popular government the people can blame only themselves if they suffer from protracted exploitation at the hands of a party organization.<sup>61</sup>

#### 8. Problem of Political Reform and Progress.

Stuckenberg's opinions as to the most urgent necessities in the matter of political reform have already been pointed out. In internal or domestic political organization he urges the development of a more specialized knowledge for governmental officials, the elimination of the evil phases of partisan politics, the democratization of political institutions, and the development of organs for the expression of united and intelligent political action in emergencies.<sup>62</sup> In the field of international politics, he demands an extension of the principle of international arbitration and, ultimately, the realization of international federation.<sup>63</sup> The chief means of realizing these aims is the improvement and extension of education, both in general matters, and particularly in sociology, political science, and international law.<sup>64</sup>

To conclude one may safely say that while Stuckenberg sets forth no unique and novel special contribution to political theory his work constitutes as typical, balanced and generally acceptable an exposition of the sociological theory of the state as can be found in the writings of any modern sociologist and is a harbinger of a broader and sounder approach to political problems.

*Worcester, Mass.*

60 Ibid. pp. 104-5.

61 Ibid. pp. 101-2.

62 Ibid. pp. 101-103.

63 Ibid. pp. 135 ff.

64 Ibid. pp. 103, 154-6, 183, 192, 271-4.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE APOSTOLIC AGE AND WRITINGS CONSIDERED WITH REFERENCE TO SOME RECENT CRITICISM.

PROF. J. M. HANTZ

The very sweeping and one-sided character of the Tübingen inquiries, the dogmatic prejudices to which their criticisms are made subordinate, the utterly distinctive character of the criticisms themselves, the wholesale suppression or rejection of every title of evidence which appears to tell against them, and the undue stress laid on questionable authorities or doubtful expressions which can be forced to their support, together with the wild and fanciful interpretations applied to some of the few authorities who are allowed to speak at all, would all, no doubt, have contributed largely to discredit their theories from the first moment of their promulgation, could they have been at once nakedly and openly laid before the world. The credit and influence which the school actually acquired for a time in its native country, and which some writers are attempting to revive in England and United States after they have become in a great measure a thing of the past in Germany, were probably in no slight degree owing to the gradual manner in which its conclusions were laid before the public so as to give them the appearance only, of successive results raised step after step on successively secured foundations. The history of the several steps by which the theory was promulgated may serve to account for a plausibility in its several portions, which can hardly be accorded to it when it is regarded as a whole and its entire result tested by the evidence on which they rest. The earliest contribution of the Tübingen School to the peculiar form of historical and biblical criticism to which it has given a name, is an essay

published by Bauer in 1831 on "The Party of Christ in the Corinthian Church. (*Die Christus-Partei der Korinthischen Gemeinde, und der Apostel Petress in Röm.*, Tübingen Zeitschrift, 1831). The primary object of this essay, the substance of which was republished in 1845 in the author's work on *St. Paul*, was to show that the four parties mentioned by St. Paul in the beginning of his first epistle, "Every one of you saith, I am Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ," were in part but subdivisions of two great parties, that of the Judaizers who contended for the universal obligation of the Mosaic Law, and that of the advocates of Christian liberty; the former supporting themselves by the authority of Peter, and the latter by that of Paul. The party of Apollos, he argued, could not have differed in any important respect from that of Paul; both teachers representing essentially the same view of Christianity. And in like manner the so-called party of Christ was but another name for that of Peter, being composed of judaizing Christians who maintained that it was essential to the office of an Apostle that he should have been a personal follower of the Lord during His life on earth, and who therefore denied the apostolic authority of St. Paul and regarded the true mission as entrusted to the twelve alone, and especially to St. Peter. That the party calling itself by the name of Christ was substantially identical with that of St. Peter, representing at the most, if a distinction must be made, only an extreme section of the latter, (Bauer, *Paulus*, I, p. 325), seems proved, in the opinion of the author, by the tenth and eleventh chapters of the second Epistle to the Corinthians, in which St. Paul, after proclaiming his own equal share in Christ with those who expressly claimed it, "If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is Christ's even so are we Christ's," asserts shortly afterwards that he was not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles (*τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων*) thus proceeding from the false apostles (*ψευδ-ἀπόστολοι ἐργάται δόλαιοι*) by whom he was directly opposed in Corinth to the heads of the party in Palestine whom these professed

to follow, and with whom they must have been in some way connected. (*Die Christus Partie*, p. 100; Compare *Paulus I*, pp. 306, 309). That this party consisted of Judaizers, claiming some especial privilege or authority by virtue of their Jewish descent, is shown by St. Paul's emphatic assertion of the same privileges as belonging to himself, "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I." That they despised the authority of St. Paul, and regarded him as no true Apostle, because he had not been a personal follower of Christ, is shown by St. Paul's own appeal in the ninth chapter of the first epistle, "Am I not an Apostle?" That the opposition between the teaching of this party and that of St. Paul was of the most essential and fundamental character, is manifested in Bauer's opinion, by the Apostolic language: "If he that cometh preacheth another Jesus whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit which ye have not received, or another Gospel which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him," (II Cor. 11:4)—language which the critic strangely, and against the whole force of the argument, interprets as conveying an accusation on St. Paul's part against his opponents that the Gospel preached by them was wholly different from his. (*Die Christus Partie*, p. 102; *Paulus I*, p. 309). And finally, to show that these Corinthian antagonists of St. Paul must have been to some extent authorized and accredited by the older Apostles. Bauer refers to the epistles of commendation which some persons (*τινες*) had brought as an introduction to the Corinthian Church (IICor. 3:1); which he understands as meaning letters from the Apostles at Jerusalem, entrusted to the opponents of St. Paul certifying them as trustworthy teachers; and rendered necessary by the party-divisions between the twelve and St. Paul which made it of the utmost importance that any professed teacher coming among strangers should be accredited as trustworthy by the heads of the party to which he belonged. (Bauer, *Paulus I*, p. 313).

The next step towards the establishment of the theory

would be to show that this supposed antagonism between Petrine and Pauline Christianity was not confined to the Corinthian Church, but might be traced in other congregations also; thus showing its general prevalence wherever Christianity was preached, and therefore in all probability its origin in the teaching of the Apostles themselves. For this purpose, Bauer, in a subsequent essay, applied himself to examine another of the few epistles which his criticism allowed to be genuine remains of St. Paul—that to the Romans. (*Ueber Zweck und Veranlassung der Roman briefs* in Tüb. Zeitscher. für 1836. Afterwards worked into the author's *Paulus*). The main purpose of this epistle, he declared, is not to be found in the doctrine of justification by faith for Jew and Gentile alike, as declared in the earlier chapters—the true kernel of the epistle—the portion which indicates, the purpose and occasion of its being written, is to be found in the 9th, 10th and 11th chapters which speak of the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles. (*Ueber Zweck*, cc. p. 71; Cf. *Paulus* I, p. 351). The epistle must have been occasioned by the existence of a party in the Roman Church who were opposed to the universalism of St. Paul, and maintained that Israel as Israel was alone entitled to the promises of God. (*Ibid.*, p. 72). These men were not Jews, as is sometimes supposed, but Judaizing Christians who regarded conformity to Judaism as a necessary condition of redemption through Christ, and considered unconditional admission of Gentiles, as an unjust attempt to rob the chosen people of their covenanted privileges. In opposition to their teaching, the Apostle maintains that the true condition of receiving the promises is not bodily descent from Abraham, but adoption by grace of those whom God chooses to be His people, whether by natural birth Jews or Gentiles. The Judaizers, whom St. Paul has to meet in this epistle, are not, says Bauer, violent personal antagonists like those of Corinth; they are men who look with suspicion on the effects of his teaching, but without any violent hostility to himself, and towards whom, accordingly, his tone is rather that of conciliation than of defiance. They seem

to have thought that the circumstances of the Gentiles having embraced the Gospel more readily than the Jews, so that Christ seemed rather to be a Saviour of the Gentiles than the promised Messiah of the chosen people was due to the indiscriminate manner in which St. Paul had admitted Gentile converts into the Church, without insisting on circumcision or any other acknowledgement in this manner amounted virtually to a casting off by God of his people, (Bauer, *Paulus*, I p. 355). This view the Apostle refutes in the three chapters which contain the main argument of the epistle, but the tone of the refutation is rather that of conciliation than of hostility. In support of this view, Bauer maintains, contrary to the usual opinion that the vast majority of the Christians at Rome belonged to the Judaizing party, and that the object of St. Paul's writing may therefore be traced to a desire to remove from the minds of the majority of the Church the prejudices which they had imbibed against his teaching.

In support of this view, the critic further appeals to the practical exhortations contained in the 13th and 14th chapters of the Epistle; the former enjoining subjection to the higher powers, the latter, mutual charity in respect of things in themselves indifferent, such as eating of meats or observing of days. (*Ueber Zweck*, u. s. w. p. 128 seq.; cf. *Paulus* I, p. 381). The Roman Jewish Christian, like the Jewish Christians in general shared to some extent in Ebionite principles. The Ebionites were distinguished by their ascetic practices; they abstained from animal food, and from strong drinks; they were also more zealous than other Jews in their hatred of heathen authority, regarding earthly powers as representations of the kingdom of Satan. (*Ueber Zweck*, u. s. w. p. 131). In opposition to this extravagance, the Apostle expressly asserts that there is no power but of God, that the powers that be are ordained of God.

At this point, however, the critic meets with a difficulty, which, if not disposed of, is fatal to this entire theory. In the 15th chapter St. Paul tells his Roman

readers that he is going up to Jerusalem to convey a contribution which has been made by those of Macedonia and Achaia for the poor saints, which are at Jerusalem. All this seems natural enough; especially as the Apostle had mentioned this same contribution in both of his Epistles to the Corinthians. I Cor. 16: 1, 2; II Cor. 8:9). But unfortunately, in the present passage, this seemingly natural and incidental allusion is accompanied by a remark which by no means accords with what St. Paul ought to have said according to the modern reconstruction of his history. He goes on to say that in making this contribution the Gentile Churches are but discharging a debt; 'for if the Gentiles have been partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.' Rom. 15:27). But St. Paul, according to Bauer's theory, preached another Gospel from that of the Judaizing Apostles, and acknowledged no obligation, but rather the contrary, to the Church at Jerusalem. How could he possibly say that his own Churches of Macedonia and Achaia had received spiritual things from Jerusalem? The ready resource is at once at hand. This chapter is of course spurious, added by one writing in the Jewish interest. (*Paulus* I, p. 402; cf. *Ueber Zweck*, u. s. w., p. 162), who in the same spirit makes the Apostle speak of himself as having preached the Gospel from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum. (Rom. 15:19; cf. *Bauer Ueber Zweck*, u. s. w., p. 156; *Paulus* I, p. 397). The 16th chapter is also rejected, as being forged with the view of giving St. Paul a larger number of acquaintances in Rome and a more personal connection with the Roman Church than the theory allows him to have had; and thus out of his epistle, one of the only four accepted as genuine, two chapters have to be expunged before it can be made to speak as the critic desires. With such license of cooking evidence, it is not difficult to compose a history to suit any theory, which the composer may wish to maintain.

After this representation of the relations existing between the Pauline and Petrine parties in the Churches of

Corinth, it is easy to anticipate the view which the critic will take of the relations between the Apostles themselves, as they may be gathered from the Epistle to the Galatians, the sole remaining work of St. Paul which is admitted to be genuine. The position of St. Paul with reference to the elder Apostles is throughout represented as one of hostility; he has to force from them an acknowledgement of his right to a sphere of Apostolic labor; (cf. Bauer, *Paulus* I, p. 254) he has to contend, throughout the whole conflict concerning the obligation of the Mosaic law, not, as is represented in the Acts, with certain believers of the sect of the Pharisees, but with the whole body of Jewish Christians headed by the elder Apostles who themselves must have taken part in insisting on the circumcision of Titus. Though St. Paul himself attributes this demand to "false brethren unawares brought in," (παρεισακτων ψευδάδελφοι), the tenor of the narrative implies, says Bauer, that the Apostles themselves were no strangers to the design, and in fact supported it. (*Paulus*, p. 138). When St. Paul says that they who seemed to be somewhat, in conference added nothing to him (ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο), this must be understood to mean that the Apostles endeavored to overcome St. Paul, both by their authority and by argument, but were not able to induce him to adopt their view. (*Paulus*, p. 141). All this is marvellously got out of προσανέθεντο which really means "only, they communicated nothing to me," they saw nothing defective in my teaching but on the contrary heartily recognized my mission. (See Lightfoot on Gal. II:6). St. Paul, opposed himself to St. Peter, "so that man stands against man, teacher against teacher, one Gospel against the other, one apostleship against the other." By showing what he had done among the Gentiles, St. Paul forces his antagonists to acknowledge that the same power was given him as to Peter, and compelled them to give him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, and to promise that they would not hinder them in their work among the heathen. But this fellowship, says Bauer,

was at the same time a separation, they agreed only to pursue their different courses in their different fields of labor; the elder Apostles permitted St. Paul to take his own course with the Gentiles, but they themselves would know nothing about it; they resolved to pursue their own mission among the Jews with a separate Gospel of the circumcision, insisting still on the observance of the Mosaic law by all Jewish converts. (*Paulus*, p. 143). It will be observed that this ingenious exposition not only shows an entirely new light on the Apostolic history, but also makes discovery of a circumstance hitherto unknown to Greek lexicographers; namely that the word *κοινωνία* means having nothing to do with a man.

After thus representing the "right hand of fellowship" given by the elder Apostles to Paul and Barnabas, not as an approval of their mission but simply as an ignoring of it, the critic proceeds to tell us that in consequence of their decision, the Jewish Christian party was broken into two sections. The stricter section still upheld the Judaizing principle, and united on practically confessing it. Men followed St. Paul everywhere to the several churches formed by him, in order to overthrow his work by insisting on bringing his converts into obedience to the Jewish law. The middle section, to which the Apostles must be regarded as belonging, agreed entirely in principle with the others, but were unable practically to enforce the principle in consequence of their agreement to let St. Paul alone (*Paulus* I, p. 145-6). In other words, we must understand that Peter, James and John, the pillars of the Jewish Christians, secretly approved of the conduct of St. Paul's antagonists, though they did not openly take part in it, keeping perhaps the letter of their agreement, but breaking the spirit, afraid to molest their brother Apostles personally but rejoicing to see the work done by bolder and more unscrupulous spirits. Surely never was a libel on the character of holy men reared on more unstable foundations.

The subsequent controversy between St. Peter and St. Paul at Antioch is of course distorted to suit the same

view, the plain account of this controversy, as told by St. Paul himself, clearly does not represent St. Peter as a rigid asserter of the obligation of the Jewish law. He does not even observe it in his own person; he eats with Gentiles, thus acting quite in accordance with the words ascribed to him in the Acts. "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company or come unto one of another nation, but God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean." (Acts 10:28). What is blamed in him by St. Paul is simply inconsistency with his own principles, he afterwards "withdrew and separated himself, fearing them what were of the circumcision," thus practically by his weakness supporting the Judaizing party which in principle he condemned, and thus by example, though not by precept, siding with those who compelled the Gentiles to live as the Jews. (See Lightfoot on Gal. 2:14). A strict Judaizer as Bauer represents Peter to have been, would never have eaten with the Gentiles at all, and this incident, which is recorded by St. Paul himself, not only completely refutes Bauer's theory, but indirectly establishes the history of St. Peter's previous intercourse with Cornelius, which Bauer rejects as unhistorical, because the Peter of his own romance could not have acted and spoken in such a Pauline manner. (Cf. Bauer, *Paulus*, I, p. 143). I need scarcely remark also how much more in accordance it is with the character of St. Peter as described in the Gospel, to suppose that under a momentary weakness he withdrew from a concession which his principles required him to make to the Gentile converts than that, being as Bauer represents him, a strict Judaizer, he volunteered, without any apparent motive, to adopt a course of life strictly forbidden by his own law.

Thus regarded, the whole narrative is natural and simple, and perfectly compatible with the history recorded in the Acts. Bauer's attempt to raise a contradiction between the two is based on arbitrary assumptions made on the merest conjecture. He assumes that

the persons who came to Antioch from James were authorized in what they did by that Apostle himself, and therefore that he could have taken part in the conciliatory decree of the council at Jerusalem, as represented in the Acts, whereas the very words of the decree itself imply that the Judaizing teachers falsely claimed an apostolic sanction for their proceedings. (Acts 15:24; cf. Bauer *Paulus* I, p. 155). He assumes also that this controversy produced a permanent breach between St. Paul and St. Peter, which still continued when, probably seven years afterwards, the former apostle wrote to the Galatians, (*Paulus* I, p. 150), and that the effects of this disunion lasted so long and produced so much offense that the writer of the Acts found it necessary to suppress the history, and to dwell upon another motive for the contentions between Paul and Barabas. (*Paulus* I, p. 148). On this piece of hypercriticism, it has been fairly remarked by another distinguished German critic, that it exactly reverses the facts of the case, that whereas St. Paul clearly represents St. Peter as agreeing in conviction with himself, and rebukes him for conduct inconsistent with his own principles, Bauer and his followers on the other hand represent him as denying his own convictions at first, and only going back to them when he abandoned, through fear of previous intercourse with the Gentile converts. (See Lechler, *Das Apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalter*, p. 426.) The same writer has also pointed out that the narrative in the Galatians, instead of contradiction, indirectly confirms St. Luke's account of the Council at Jerusalem. The controversy at Antioch, as described by St. Paul, no longer turns on the question whether it is necessary for Gentile converts to be circumcised and to submit to the law of Moses; but on the subsequent question as to the amount of intercourse which Jewish Christians may hold with their uncircumcised Gentile brethren. That this question should have taken the place of the other clearly implies that some such decision as that of the Council had settled the earlier point of controversy, before the discussion was

transferred from Jerusalem to Antioch. (Cf. Lechler, l. c. p. 425).

While Bauer was endeavoring to elicit from St. Paul's Epistles his supposed evidence of the hostility between the Apostle of the Gentiles and those of the circumcision, his disciple Zeller came to the aid of the argument by an essay on the Apocalypse of St. John (published in the *Theologische Jahrbucher* for 1842), in which he announced the notable discovery to which I have before referred, namely, that the disciples of St. Paul are the persons condemned in that book under the name of the Nicolaitans. (Zeller, l. c., p. 706; cf. Schwegler, (*Der Montanismus*, p. 213, 1841). Zeller, as his fellow disciple Schwegler had done the year before, regards the Apocalypse as a genuine work of the Apostle whose name it bears; and considers it to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, (Again Zeller, l. c., p. 662) and therefore during the life of St. Paul, or very shortly after his death. To some portions of this essay, bearing on other points of the controversy, I shall have occasion to refer hereafter; at present we are concerned only with the single argument which it addresses in support of the first position of the Tübingen School, the hostility between St. Paul and the other Apostles. On the very doubtful etymology which attempts to identify the name of Nicolas with that of Balaam, and the direct opposition of the theory to all the historical evidence which we possess, I have clearly spoken in a former article: I will only now further observe that an additional argument against the theory may be gathered from the language of St. Paul himself in one of the epistles which the Tübingen School acknowledges. St. Paul, though not mentioning the name of Balaam, takes occasion to argue from the same event in Jewish history, against the very same vice that is reprehended by St. John, "Neither let us commit fornication as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand." (Cor. 10:8; cf. Numb. 25:9). With this proof of coincidence between the teaching of the two Apostles, as a learned English divine

has recently remarked, it is a strange phenomenon that any critic should maintain that the denunciations in the Apocalypse are directed against St. Paul himself. (Light-foot, *Galatians*, p. 298).

We have now given a history of the first step in the Tübingen criticism and the evidence by which it is supported. It is at least a remarkable coincidence that the only five books of the New Testament which the critics of this school accept as genuine, are those which they think they can use in support of their theory of discord in the Apostolic teaching. The remaining features of their criticism and estimate of its value must be reserved for our next article.

*Alliance, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE III.

## RELIGION IN EVERY DAY LIFE.

BY THE REV. GEORGE E. BOWERSOX.

"They go to Church on Sunday  
They'll be alright on Monday,  
It's a habit they've got."

This somewhat cynical observation of Christian conduct has back of it the fact that, not infrequently there is a wide divergence between a man's religion as voiced in the church and revealed in the daily life.

God's program for us is one for all the days. "Six days shalt thou labor,—but the seventh is the Sabbath". Thus the days might seemingly be divided into the sacred and secular. But let us bear in mind that the moral injunctions of the other nine commands are applicable to all the days referred to in the third. The worship of God on one day of the week does not in any sense excuse the worshipper from the recognition of Him and the acceptance of His will for all the days. Reverence for God's name, respect for parents, sanctity of life, property, honor, and truth, freedom from covetousness, these are requirements for every day.

Religion in every day life presupposes a religious observance of the Lord's day. If we seem in this article to stress the religion of shop, farm, office, factory and market place, it is on the assumption that the religious observance of the Lord's day precedes. Weekday practice of Christianity is highly improbable, if not impossible without the proper recognition of the day of worship.

The Creator who made man capable of divine fellow-

ship, made provision for its cultivation especially in ordaining a day of rest and spiritual recuperation.

"Between the tired days stretched behind,  
And the trying days spread out before ,  
Slips one dear day since God is kind,  
That holds His peace in store.

Across the fitful thoughts of strife,  
The sordid thoughts of greed,  
Slips gently one sweet day of life,  
His thought who knows our need.

What soul could bear its heart of care,  
Its weight of anguish keen ;  
Without this day of rest and prayer,  
God's thought for us, between."

With this recognition of the oneness of our days, we approach the thought of "Religion in every day life" as

- (1). A Sacred Privilege,
- (2). A Christian Obligation, and
- (3). A Social Necessity.

#### I. A Sacred Privilege.

The Oriental has a way of taking his god with him to the tasks of life by fancying a god for every task: to the rice fields, his rice god; to the battlefield his god of war; to pleasure another god. Even if his purpose is revenge or crime, there is a god to consult. The Christian conception of one God is however of such nature that we may realize his favor and presence in every honorable calling or occupation. Not merely the one who withdraws from human society, or he who is engaged in so-called sacred work, but all God's children will manifest their religion in daily life. A machine expresses the idea of its inventor when it accomplishes perfectly the work

for which it was designed; the building the ideal of the architect when it fits the place and use for which intended; the book, the purpose of the author when it perfectly conveys the thought of his mind. Similarly man was fashioned by his Creator for fellowship and service. God came to talk with him in the cool of the day; and assigned tasks to be performed. The secrets of the winds he locked, and man must by searching find them out. Treasures he hid and man must discover. Soils he enriched but man must cultivate. Thus we may look upon the tasks of life with a sense of dignity. Whether our life task be building walls of stone or breaking walls of prejudice; whether deepening soils or enriching character; whether training the mind or minding the train; whether in the home or upon the forum, in every honorable work, honorably performed we may retain touch with Him who said: "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." Work becomes not a mere money making process but a means of religious expression. The husbandman can find a friend in the Author of the parable of "Four kinds of Soil" and of the "Vine and its Branches." The mechanic can fellowship with the yokemaker of Nazareth; the tradesman can know the seeker of pearls; the financier can catch the spirit of the parable of pounds; the teacher find ready companionship with the Master teacher; the reformer breathe the zeal of the cleanser of the temple. In fact all useful service may be performed in a consciousness of the divine presence. A failure to realize this makes the laborer a slave, the daily tasks of life drudgery; the highest types of work less noble. Mr. Wells, in his book "Plain talks to young men and women who work" gives us this fable: "A lithe limbed young farmer goes out in the early morning to plow. In the crisp air of the early day you might have heard his cheery voice as he bade the beasts go on, and urged them forward by the keen crack of the whip he was wielding over the backs of the slow moving oxen. Noontide comes and the plowman but bends lower over his task. The evening shadows grow long but the absorbed worker is all unmindful of the

passing day. Deaf to the day-long bird-songs, blind to the beauties of sky and field about him, the worker thinks only of his task and plods painfully on. Suddenly his bent shoulders feel the sharp smart of the whip, and looking down he discovers that the hands that hold the plow have turned to hoofs, instead of driving the oxen he is now drawing the plow and being driven by the beasts." It is scarcely a fable but a photograph of thousands who become so absorbed in the appointed tasks of life, that they lose their real meaning and the happiness they are intended to bestow. To all of God's creatures He has given a place and work; but man is supreme over the beast, in that he is superior to the work assigned. A religious consciousness then in our daily tasks of life is a sacred privilege. The man or woman who would worship God in the temple loses the richer intent of worship, if in tasks of daily life the presence of God is not felt. A farmer may be a farmer for God. A business man a partner with Him. A student, a learner of His thoughts.

## II. A Christian Obligation.

The great Teacher has put it both forcefully and beautifully: "Even so let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in Heaven" These words reveal a fact and a principle. The fact: Every possession and privilege becomes an obligation; The principle: Christianity advances by the inherent contagion of its goodness.

Christ never tuned harps to hang upon the willows; he never lighted lamps to be placed under bushels; he never gave talents or pounds to be hidden in the earth or wrapped in a napkin; but to be used in forum and marketplace; he never plowed ground that it should lie fallow but receive seed and bring forth fruit. He opened eyes that they should never again be covered with dark glasses. He unstopped ears that they might "take heed what they hear." He filled men's minds and hearts with

His truth and compassion that they should be channels of truth and mercy. Our Christian knowledge, our material blessings, our personal endowments become Christian obligations, to be used for Him.

"Even so let your light shine." The light is the light which Christ has given us. His plan is that through us others shall be directed to Him. The principle is that of contagion. We dare not limit that principle to disease and evil, that it applies there is not to be doubted. When small-pox breaks out in a community, the pest house is the first thought. For that disease and many others are known to be contagious. Moral evil is not less so.

Crime, which has come in great waves and terrorized our cities and countrysides, has not been merely terrible but contagious. "What happens once will happen twice" has some truth in it concerning moral evil, because crime becomes suggestive. However if evil is contagious, good is so also. There are associations in which it is easier to do right than wrong. Those who have been privileged to visit places like Northfield, or our Summer Assembly at Gettysburg or similar gatherings of Christian people will readily realize the truth of this. Where have the impulses for righteousness and compassion most frequently met us; in the market place or in the sanctuary?

The principle is true of Christianity. Its source is from above; but its market place is earth, and its best advertisement is its product. Christ meant that it should be contagious. Ye are leaven, infect; ye are salt, flavor; ye are light, illuminate. We like the thought expressed in Acts 4:13 "And when they beheld the boldness of Peter and John they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus." In the following verse, in the person of the man whom they had healed we have the same truth; "And seeing the man who was healed standing with them, they could say nothing." The Christian must always stand as Christianity's unanswerable argument.

The incident is related of two small girls the one a professor's daughter who had recently moved to the community the other a little playmate who was much in-

fatuated with her grandmother's new picture Bible. The latter asks the former, Do you have religion at your house too? Yes, she answers hesitatingly, and then fearing lest she had made an awkward admission, added, "but mother never uses it unless it is first sterilized." This is doubtless the case with much religious practice; so thoroughly sterilized that no one is in danger of catching it.

A contagious Christianity has certain vital marks. It will be consistent. "Not all that say to me Lord, Lord shall enter the kingdom of Heaven." Inconsistency is the usual failure of the Christian life; but there is a failure more extensive. It is indicated in the curse pronounced upon those who became stumbling-blocks in the path of others, and in the curse of barrenness pronounced upon the disappointing fig tree. It is in truth a fine compliment to Christianity, that even the unbeliever expects a higher standard of honesty, morality, and generosity in the Christian than in any one else. It is sad when such expectation is not fulfilled. When a man of the world fails in character the failure is personal, but when a Christian fails it is a reflection upon the cause of Christ. A dirty window is never so conspicuous as when the rays of the sun fall upon it, so also is the impure and unclean life when viewed in the light of Christ.

Consistency determines the measure of our influence. Some disease germs are more vital than others; some have a life of several weeks; some of many years. A number of years ago when the old paupers' cemetery in the city of York was removed to make place for the High School buildings, those in charge of the work kept kettles of burning oil about the plot in order to destroy the infection. It appears that years before there were a number of smallpox victims buried there, and it was feared that infectious germs might still live. The precaution was wise, for those germs have great vitality.

The inoculating power of vital religion is very great. Has it affected every phase of our personal living? Has it touched our home life? Has it made itself felt in our

business and social circles ? Does it color and enrich our world outlook ? The story is told of a young man who went to work in lumber camps. His friends feared for his religion in the new surroundings. Six months later he returned and his old friends asked, Was it not rather hard to be a Christian there? "No," was the reply. "I was there six months and no one knew I was a Christian!" It is altogether possible that the average Church register contains names of persons with no truer faith.

Christianity to be attractive must show the mark of happiness. We refer not merely to that type of exuberance that only overflows in meeting. Whatever may be your opinion of that, it has the advantage over a meeting which we once attended, where when a brother would pray, all the faithful groaned. We refer, particularly, to that attitude towards the Church and the things for which it stands, that is revealed in a man or woman proud of and enthusiastic in forwarding its program. We refer to that attitude towards Christian truth that shows a believer to be confident in faith, hopeful of the future, and zealous for good works. You will understand what Dr. Watkinson has in mind when he says: "Some people spend entirely too much time on the northeast side of their religion"—the side of storms, blizzards, cold chilly rains, and gloomy outlook. The captious critic, "the kill-joy," "the knocker," the pessimist—who Mr. Catell says is the blind man in a dark room looking for a black hat that isn't there—these and a host of their friends misrepresent religion as all gloom.

It is in truth a Christian obligation to daily manifest Christ to the world and to so witness to His love and life that men may be drawn to Him.

### III. A Social Necessity.

Approaching our theme from the standpoint of the world's lack today, religion in daily life becomes a social necessity.

If one cared to use dark colors, it would not be difficult

to paint an alarming picture of the present social status. Viewing society from the standpoint of the family—the fundamental social unit—we are confronted with two menacing evils. One of the busiest industries of the country is the divorce mill. Someone has put it pointedly in saying that one-half the people are trying to get married and the other half unmarried. Reports show that during the past twenty years the total “damaged goods” of divorce including the children of the unhappy couples has reached one-twentieth of the population of the country. The prevalence of divorce and re-marriage of divorced persons in all classes of society reveals the necessity of stress upon the Master’s interpretation of the sixth commandment.

Another major evil, among the many warring against the home is childless homes among those best able to educate and train the child. In the so-called better sections of our cities children are alarmingly few, while in the more congested sections they are so numerous as to present a problem in regard to their care and education. This condition in great cities among the very wealthy, is true also of the great middle classes, as can readily be observed in almost any community. Economic independence before and after marriage, unwillingness to make the necessary sacrifices of pleasure and freedom, high living costs and many minor causes are given as excuses for childlessness. The remedy for this state of things lies in the teaching and practice of the Rooseveltian interpretation of the fifth commandment—“Thou shalt not kill.”

Looking at the social necessity of religion from viewpoint of our public pleasures gives a similar picture. There is doubtless much room for improvement in the motive of American pleasure. The sexual on stage and screen means larger dividends to stockholders. The sensual and even lewd finds ready popularity in public hall, club and private dance. In fact we feel we are not putting it too strongly when we say that the major trend of pleasure is not recreation or inspiration, but rather sen-

sation and temptation. Again we see the necessity of urging Christian standards in support of and in participation in pleasures really worth while.

The need of every day religion in political life scarcely calls for argument, when we recall that recently in our state legislature was offered a bill permitting communities to decide whether God knew his business when He gave the commandment of the Sabbath day. This legislature actually passed a saloon license bill to enforce a prohibition amendment! The sad complement of state politics is found not infrequently in national and international affairs, not less dishonest but more clever. Political life reveals the need of the wholesome touch of every-day religion.

We would not presume to analyze the economic chaos of today for chaotic it is indeed. It is spoken of as a period of deflation, retrenchment, and readjustment. Many reasons are set forth to account for it. A recent report of the Federal Trade Commission speaks of unfair competition, excessive prices of basic commodities, restricted credits, corporate monopolies, open price associations, unnatural interference with channels of trade, and foreign combinations in the international market. If to these we add mass psychology, an awakening of dormant common sense, and any other causes one may choose; there yet underlie it all some facts of economic dishonesty. Economic inflation means dishonesty somewhere. And when inflation takes place deflation is bound to follow. Try it on a check or note. The temptations of prosperity were too great for a moral stamina never overly strong. The rule "All the traffic will bear" has been too generally applied. That capital and labor have been equally to blame is seen in the "cost plus" plans of war work, when both profited at the same game. A recent article by Mr. Long, prominent in the lumber trade, says "The outstanding needs of American economic life today are honesty and industry." Mr. Babson, the premier business analyst, puts it pointedly when he says, "We need a genuine return to religion."

Viewed then from what point we will, American social life needs a daily practice of Christianity.

In Eph. 2:10, the apostle calls us to noble living saying: "for we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Mr. H. G. Miller maintains in commenting on this that it should be translated "God's poem" instead of workmanship, the word having that meaning in classical Greek. Be that as it may, our Christian life and character should be God's poem in that it represents his teachings harmonized in our practice.

When the friends of Richard the Lion-hearted sought his place of imprisonment, a musician in the disguise of a tramp was sent from prison to prison. Wandering about from place to place he played Richard's favorite melody. At length he was rewarded by hearing the familiar voice of Richard respond to the melody. The religion of daily life should be a fitting response to the melody of our sanctuary songs .

*Shrewsbury, Pa.*

## ARTICLE IV.

## THE UNION MOVEMENTS BETWEEN LUTHERANS AND REFORMED.

BY PROF. J. L. NEVE, D.D.

## Reflections Regarding Present-Day Union Movements in America.

Literature: *The Christian Union Quarterly*, edited by Dr. Peter Ainslie, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md. We call attention to all the issues of 1919, especially to that of January. See also the January and April issues of 1920. The references in this chapter are chiefly to the preceding chapters of our series.

*I. The Problem of Church Union in America is not the same as in Germany.*

In our examination of the union movements among the Germans we had a practical end in view. We wanted to furnish a historical material from which lessons might be drawn for an attitude to movements in America, in which the Lutheran Church is counted upon to enter into union with the Reformed group of American Protestantism. We shall open these concluding reflections with a consideration of the Union problems as we have it in America.

In Germany it was the aim of the friends of Church Union to unite only the Lutherans and the *German-Reformed*. In the second chapter of our series of investigations we have made clear what we understand by the "German-Reformed." It is a type of German Protestantism, which originated through the early influences of Zwingli upon some of the Southern parts of Germany. This influence was especially strong in the so-called *Cities of Upper Germany* with Bucer at Strasburg as their leading factor. It was a movement which later was controlled by Calvin and spread to the Palatinate, to Bremen, Nassau, Anhalt, Hesse-Cassel, Lippe, Branden-

burg, to parts of East Friesland and to the Rhine Provinces where it was found when the Hohenzollerns came to rule.<sup>1</sup> The confessional bond of union was the Heidelberg Catechism. They held to Calvin's teaching on the means of grace but as a rule did not follow him in his doctrine of predestination. In the German-Reformed we have a Calvinism "modified by the German genius" (Richards). In some of the above mentioned dominions (in Anhalt, for instance) the prevailing type was nearer to Melancthonianism than to what we would call genuinely Reformed. It must be understood that union in Germany—and the same is true of the German Evangelical Synod of North America—means a union of the Lutherans with a type of the Reformed in which there is, as a rule, an absence of "high Calvinism,"<sup>2</sup>

When in America the Lutheran Church is invited to become a partner in union movements, a far more comprehensive program is planned. In the movement known as "The Call for a World Conference on Faith and Order by the Protestant Episcopal Church" (1910), as also in the "Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity" of the Disciples (1910), invitations are extended even to the Greek Catholic and the Roman Catholic churches.<sup>3</sup> And all Protestant churches "who accept Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior" are included, of course. In the "Call for a Conference on Organic Union of the Evangelical Protestant Bodies in America by the Presbyterian Church" (Dec. 1918)<sup>4</sup> the invitation was to all the Protestant churches in so far as they are "evangelical" or "orthodox." The following churches participated actively in the first conference held at Philadelphia 1919: Episcopalians, Presbyterians, United

1 We refer to Dr. James I. Good, *The Origin of the Reformed Church in Germany*; also his *History of the Reformed Church in Germany*; also his *Heidelberg Catechism in its Newest Light*.

2 Cf. chapter two, sec. vii.

3 See Peter Ainslie, "Towards Christian Unity," p. 48; also *If Not a United Church—What?* Also in *Christian Union Quarterly*, Oct. 1920, pp. 135, 119 f. Regarding Rome, see in the minutes of the last General Synod (1917), pp. 123 ff., Dean Dr. Bauslin's criticism of the letter of Cardinal Gaspari on behalf of Pope Benedict, written as an answer to overtures of one of the conferences on "Faith and Order."

4 See *The Christian Union Quarterly*, all issues of 1919.

Presbyterians, Reformed, German Evangelical Synod, Congregationalists, Methodists, United Brethren, Moravians, Baptists, Disciples of Christ, Society of Friends. A reading of these names reminds us at once of the conflicting confessional positions to be reconciled in such an "organic union." If the Lutherans should join such a movement the problem would be forbiddingly difficult. The Lutheran confessional positions as expressed in the Augsburg Confession of 1531 would have to be reconciled not only with the spiritualistic conception of the means of grace, as was the case in Germany, but also with the predestinarianism of high Calvinism or with the Arminianism of the opposite wing of Reformed Protestantism and with the standpoints which emphasize such matters as church organization, mode of baptism, etc. There are difficulties in the way of a full Protestant Union in America, especially when the Lutheran Church is included, that were absent in the union endeavors on the other side of the Atlantic. Among these we should also count the teaching and practice of churches which may be called daughters of the Reformed Church: Methodists, the Baptists of many kinds, and the Quakers, Menonites etc.

The Lutheran Church, as long as it has not sacrificed its own genius, is fundamentally opposed to confessional indifferentism on all teaching of the Scriptures pertaining to the "Gospel." Our reference is to the use of this term in Art. VII of the Augsburg Confession.

To show how impossible it is for the Lutheran Church to fall into line with sentiments expressed at such union conferences we shall quote from a few of the papers that were read at the above mentioned conference in Philadelphia, called by the Presbyterians.<sup>5</sup>

The representative of the Congregational Churches said: "There has been a general surrender of the idea that a church must have an elaborate creedal basis. The historic creeds need not be repudiated. They are honored

5 Published in the Christian Union Quarterly, April 1919.

monuments of the faith of our fathers and witnesses to the apprehension of Christianity of those in spiritual succession to whom we gladly stand. But most Protestants are satisfied, as a present practical test of communion, with a creed which embraces only the central affirmations of the Christian faith. We are thus delivered from the necessity of demanding that our brother accept all our philosophy of the universe."<sup>6</sup> He who is familiar with customary deliverances on this subject in pulpit and church press knows that there is very much unexpressed thought back of such a deliverance. The Lutheran Church could not subscribe to these thoughts, without committing outright suicide. In the same address we read: "The sacraments instituted by Christ will be administered by each local church in the mode of its selection, but with full agreement that the mode of each sister church shall have complete recognition and that all disciples of Christ shall be equally welcome to their privileges." This is to satisfy the immersionists on their "mode" of Baptism; but how about the far more important *doctrine* of Baptism? There seems to be wide agreement that the doctrine of the Sacraments is entirely a matter of indifference. The reader for the Protestant Episcopal Church, at that convention, quoted the positions of the "Conference on Faith and Order" and insisted upon the recognition of at least "the fact of episcopacy, and not any theory as to its character." On matters of doctrine this church is willing to regard as a basis for union "the Nicene Creed as a sufficient statement of the Christian faith." This excludes a great sphere of doctrinal interest, the conflict between Augustinianism and Pelagianism and the conflict between semi-Pelagianism and the doctrine of grace as taught by the Reformers. All this is to be treated as if on the great theme of the Reformation the Church of Christ has had no special experience and needs no guide for its teaching. The speaker for the Disciples of Christ quoted as his church's position: "The Bible and the Bible alone is the

6 Christian Union Quarterly, April, 1919, p. 46.

religion of the Protestants." This could only mean: the Bible without confessional interpretation of its teaching by the Church. The united Church, then, would be asked to make no profession of what the Bible teaches. The speaker appealed to "the right of private interpretation." He continued: "The various communions have their systems of theology, based upon interpretations of the Word of God, and which they adopt as standards of their respective churches." "Since all agree that the Scriptures contain the Word of God, why could not the Scriptures alone be sufficient? They appear to have been so in the early church. Why should they not be for the Church now?"

Note: We have answered these questions in chapter VI, 8: "Scripture versus Confession." Yet we feel tempted to reply to these remarks here by saying: (1) The Church is forced to a distinct authoritative or symbolical interpretation of the Scriptures because individuals and communions with misleading teachings also claim the Bible. Adoption by a church of the Scriptures and at the same time refusing to interpret them confessionally as a bond of union is a negative or neutral and not a positive adoption. (2) The early church, in its conflicts with error (Ebionitism, Gnosticism, the pneumatics in general and an endless number of sects), was also forced to give an authoritative interpretation of the canon. We have the result of such creed-making in the "Rules of Faith," which gradually issued into the Apostles and the Nicene Creeds. (3) A grown man cannot be forced back to the state of the development of the boy. The Church of to-day has been led by the Holy Spirit into a rich doctrinal experience of the fundamental truths of Scripture. We cannot ask the Church to ignore all this in order to return, in a kind of Christian

7 In chapter VI we discussed the question how this thoroughly Lutheran principle is to be harmonized with the recognition of a common Creed for the Church. See Luth. Quarterly, Oct. 1920, pp. 428 ff. (Reprint, pp. 157 ff.)

agnosticism, to the primitive knowledge of the Christianity of the post-apostolic fathers.

Surely, as far as the Lutheran Church is concerned, there will never be a union of Protestantism if such insistence is continued upon indifferentism regarding the matters pertaining to the "Gospel." The Augsburg Confession (Art. VII) defines the Church as "the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments rightly administered." And it will be found that the matters pertaining to the Gospel do also include the conception of the means of grace, on which the great historical churches of the Reformation, the Lutheran and the Reformed of various names, have gone apart. It is in the field of soteriology with special regard to the means of grace where we need an understanding. Such things as modes of Baptism<sup>8</sup> and ordination are no essentials. The question of church government presents a problem of practical difficulty, of course. Here the democratic conception ought to receive large emphasis. But the fundamental problem of organic union is a doctrinal problem. It is the old question of how to overcome the doctrinal difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism. We repeat that previously quoted remark of Rev. J. H. Horstmann of the German Evangelical Synod (chapter VI, foot note<sup>108</sup>): "The new alignments now taking place (reference is to the family unions) are only making more clear the two antagonistic elements that need to be inwardly reconciled before anything like outward and organic union can be expected. In the last analysis Lutheranism and Calvinism, which divided European Protestantism into two hostile camps in the sixteenth century, still remain the divisive factors in twentieth." We know that modern-liberalistic theology with the Ritschlian "experience" theory and the "value judgments" as the formal principle laughs at the sug-

8 A friend who read the manuscript remarked as follows: "The mode of Baptism is in abstracto indifferent, but not so now in concreto. The moment Baptists insist on immersion they are in error, and the mode ceases to be a minor point." This is correct.

gestion of returning to a discussion of the old differences between Lutherans and Reformed. But it is the only way for trying whether it is possible *so late in history* to bring about the union of the Lutheran and the Reformed wings of Protestantism.<sup>9</sup>

If we try to analyze the situation without undue optimism, then we must say that a union of American Protestantism does not seem to be in sight. The constantly growing liberalism in the Reformed churches and their daughters is an added obstacle. At present there is only one kind of union that seems to be within reach. That is the family union. The reading of a number of the addresses at the above mentioned conference in Philadelphia on organic union has confirmed us in this question. Dr. W. M. Roberts of the Presbyterian Church spoke of a "consolidation among the churches of the Reformed Faith, which are most nearly akin in doctrine and organization," (p. 32). Dr. Wm. M. Anderson, in speaking for the United Presbyterians, said: "Our denomination stands committed to a federated agreement uniting all of the Reformed churches in America holding the Presbyterian system" (p. 39). There is already an "Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System," we read in the address of Dr. R. W. Miller for the Reformed Church (p. 58), and he says that his church "is ready for an organic union of the Presbyterian-Reformed family of churches" and adds: "These ten or more bodies, by reason of history, polity and doctrine, are practically one and should be organically united together" (p. 59). And Dr. J. W. Hamilton of the Methodist Episcopal Church said at that same convention: "There is one very important reason why you should not insist upon our going into this union with you just now. We are in the business of organic union among ourselves. . . ." (p. 55 f. ). The same is to be said of the

9 It is late in history, because the opposing views of the two sides have crystalized into dogmas on the foundation of which a large theological literature has sprung up and a different church life has developed. Cf. chap. III, close of sec. IV.

Lutheran Church in America. The aim is to unite the Lutheran synods of the United States and Canada and to draw the Lutherans of the world into a common understanding. Considerable progress has already been made. In 1917 three Norwegian synods united into one large body. Three years later the pre-eminently English speaking Lutheran bodies (General Synod, General Council, United Synod South) consolidated themselves into the United Lutheran Church in America. And at present the synods of more German constituencies are also trying to arrive at agreements. All such movements for "family union" are to be commended for two reasons: 1) They are proof of a feeling in the Church that small and petty matters must not stand in the way of union. But 2) they also show that the historic churches of Protestantism, so far as they are not too much honeycombed with rationalism, will not dismiss with indifference the matters which in the light of Scripture testimony and of historic development are of fundamental importance; these differences must be faced and settled before there can be union.<sup>10</sup>

## II. *Some Motives for Union Examined.*

Much light is shed upon the merits of present-day union movements by an examination of their motives. Some of these motives are right and some are questionable and even wrong.

We shall first mention three truly Christian motives and discuss their applicability: (1) Chief among these is the exhortation that comes from the Holy Scriptures. Christ prayed that His followers "all may be one" (John 17:21); Paul expressed it as the goal for the Church as the "body of Christ" that "we all come in the unity of the faith" (Eph. 4:13); and He recognizes only "one Lord, one faith one Baptism, one Lord and Father of all" (Eph. 4:5, 6). Followers of Jesus and believers in the testimony of His apostle cannot be opposed to a

<sup>10</sup> See the editorial in *The American Lutheran Survey*, April 14, 1920, on "Basic Lines for Christian Union."

true Christian union. But it must be a Christian union, a union in the "faith" (Eph. 4:13). It is the *objective* faith that is here meant, the *fides quae creditur*, the confession of faith; not faith as the expression of spiritual life (*fides qua creditur*), which on this side of eternity never could be made a condition of outward Church union. The correctness of our contention that in Eph. 4 Paul speaks of the objective faith is proved by verse 15: "that we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine" etc.; "but speaking the truth in love. . . ." Many zealous advocates of the cause of Christian union, in quoting the above passages, overlook entirely that it is the union in the truth of God's Word that is meant. The first duty of the Church is to be faithful to the truth "once delivered unto the saints." "If ye continue in my Word, then ye are my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" (John 9:31, 32). Those that cry for union at any price forget entirely the emphasis which in the Scriptures is placed upon divine truth (*ἀληθεια*) as the first fundamental requisite for spiritual work. Read Psalm 86:11; Isaias 8:20; James 1:18; John 17:17; 8:31, 32; Eph. 6:14; 2 John 4; Eph. 4:14. And in connection with these passages see Matth. 7:15 ff; 24:24 and 1 John 4:1. By a false union we would make error to co-exist with truth in the Church of Christ. The suggestion to find a union by "agreeing to disagree," when this is to cover matters pertaining to salvation, is unworthy of the Church. The Church is not a social or a literary club for the exchange of religious and ethical views, but it is a divine institution "in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments rightly administered" (Augsb'g Conf., Art. VII).

In the appreciation of the Word there is between the Lutheran Church on the one hand and the Reformed churches on the other that difference which we discussed in chapter VI, 3, C. But in this present day this confessional difference is augmented by a difference which has come in through modern theology: To the Lutheran

Church the Scriptures are the source of truth, and the Word as such is a power unto salvation and the seed of regeneration, the Holy Spirit always accompanying the Word. Modern theology—our reference is to Ritschlianism—has arrived at an altogether different conception of the Scriptures. The Ritschlians see the value of the Bible for the Christian chiefly in this that it reflects for our inspiration and warning the whole variety of human individuality, of human virtues and failings, of human life and endeavor. The Bible is not any more authoritative, but is, at best, only helpful for the understanding of our own inner life. It is a kind of a commentary on the personal religious life of the Christian. The objective faith is not a matter of interest anymore. This must be the explanation for the fact that in quoting the exhortations for union in the Scriptures so many overlook altogether the demand that it must be a union in the truth. The Lutheran Church has so far refused to abandon the "formal principle" of the Reformation, while in the Reformed churches there have been large concessions to the new theology. No wonder, therefore, that for the Lutheran Church the real obstacles in the way of union are today harder to be overcome than at the time of the Leipzig Colloquy in the seventeenth century (cf. chapt. III, sect. IV).

To establish our position against misunderstanding on the point here under discussion we say again: The demand of Christian union is Scriptural. No Christian can be in principle opposed to the union of the Christian churches. But it must be a union in the truth. It is because the modern movements have ignored this demand that the Lutheran Church has been unable to cooperate.

(2) The children of God through the ages and in the various churches have been and are longing for a union in the faith ("one faith," "one Baptism."). To satisfy this longing and to contribute to the realization of this hope is also a true motive for union endeavors. The thought that many true Christians are praying for union

should lead the Church, especially its leaders, to repudiate any division which is based on small and petty matters, such as organization, mode of Baptism, etc., or on teachings which in the light of the analogy of the faith (Rom. 12:6) cannot establish articles of faith.

(3) Among the motives for Church union there is one which we shall here describe and try to review with criticism. It is said that the various churches, in their separate existence, have developed certain charisms and graces which after a union would become the common possession of the whole Church.

The Danish bishop Martensen<sup>11</sup> devotes a special chapter to the ethical peculiarities of the Lutheran and the Reformed churches. The Lutheran Church, he says, has brought out in the Christian life of its members the evangelical freedom of the Christian man; the Reformed, as followers of Calvin, have been strong in organization. Lutheranism, again, in cultivating the type of Mary sitting at the feet of Jesus, has shown a special gift for the development of the inner Christian life, and in consequence has shown its strength in contemplation, mysticism, in religious song (chorals), in the forms of worship and church art; the Reformed, with a preference for the type of Martha, have shown a gift for the development of outward activity which has expressed itself in great missionary undertakings, in Christian propaganda, in Bible and tract societies. Martensen himself suggests that the characteristics which he is discussing can hardly, at least not directly, be traced back to the doctrinal differences of the two churches. This is correct. Elements of practical life, that can be traced as flowing out of erroneous doctrinal positions, such as a legalistic confounding of Law and Gospel, or a misconceiving of the relation between Church and state, can never be counted among the charisms and graces, no matter how great they may appear to the superficial observer; on the other hand, the church which is established upon the Scrip-

11 Christian Ethics, German edition, vol. I, p. 54 f.

tures will produce all the charisms. This is fundamental. However—and here is the element of truth in the thoughts of Martensen—, besides the endowments of a church, which have their root in a special comprehension of Scripture truth, there are in the various churches also the elements that must be traced to the peculiarities of the founders, even to the nationality from which they sprang. Luther was a German mystic and as such a veritable embodiment of that untranslatable German "Gemuet" which accounts for so much of that wonderful religious depth in the German chorals and in the devotional literature of the Lutheran Church; Calvin unrelenting in his logic, was stern and practical, with a genius for organization, in all of which he had a powerful appeal to the Anglo-Saxon mind. Lutheranism is mystical, Calvinism is practical, Methodism is aggressive, and so on. This it is what many advocates of union have in mind when they say that the *Una Sancta*, as a united Church, would be able to present itself to the Lord as its head and to the world as adorned with all the gifts and graces.

To many this consideration is a plausible motive for union. But we confess that we cannot endorse it so unreservedly as it is usually done, simply because of the kind of union usually aimed at. We are convinced that in an artificial union, that is in a union which does not grow out of an inner agreement in matters of faith, the Lutheran Church would lose her historical charism of guarding the truth. And as a natural consequence she would strip herself of other characteristics that have stood as bulwarks of sound religion through the ages and ought never to be sacrificed. An artificial organic union with the expectation of making the gifts and graces of the various churches a common possession of a merger body would defeat the end in view. Such gifts have their roots in the historical organizations that have produced them. These roots would suffer especially in a union which ignores the history of the churches in question, and the graces would be lost instead of preserved! Those who urge union on this ground mean

well, but they fail to see that here questions are involved, that have not been thought out to the end.

Next we shall discuss a number of motives of a more or less questionable character.

(4) The economic motive is much advanced. We shall state both the suggestion and its criticism in the following words of President Dr. Haas of Muhlenberg College: "In this age of material considerations and of big financial undertakings men are prone to judge not only commercial concerns but all interests of life from the point of view of economic advantage or disadvantage. It seems a great waste of money and effort to perpetuate a number of minor organizations when a large major organization could be formed with a great budget and a strong appeal because it saves so much in overlapping operations. It cannot be doubted that this economic motive which looks to a great central religious trust is moving many men to place a minor emphasis upon conscientious convictions which churches have long held sacred. The dream of a great organization, if it be effected without the clearest agreement in the truth, is a violation of the obligation which God has put upon the Church to keep His truth pure, undefiled and spiritually effective. A union formed through mere pressure of lay interests from a fundamentally economic emphasis is a destruction of the spiritual strength of the Church."<sup>12</sup>

(5) Many are clamoring for the union of Protestantism because of the impression which a large organization would make upon the world. Prof. Th. Graebner, recently, characterized this as "kephalomania." If it is admitted that agreement in the truth of God's Word is the supreme condition of church union then this motive needs no special discussion, except to refer to Zechariah 4:6 where we read: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." We also appreciate the strength that comes from union, but it must not be bought at the price of infidelity to a sacred trust.

<sup>12</sup> Lutheran Church Review, Jan'y 1919, p. 2.

(6) Speaking of the motives for Church union there is one to which we have referred many times in previous chapters of our general discussion. State governments, considering the Church a convenient instrument for nationalization and the accomplishment of political purposes, have followed the policy of forcing the Lutherans into a union with the Reformed. Here the Hohenzollerns, especially Elector Sigismund of Brandenburg, Elector Frederick William I (the "Great Elector") and later King Frederick William III of Prussia, have sinned much against the Lutheran Church, as we have shown. On the part of church members there must be patriotism and loyalty to the government, but the Church as such should never be manipulated for political purposes. This is a needed exhortation also for us in America. We have been told that a position upon the principles of historic Lutheranism is "out of harmony with true Americanism." Our reply is that according to the constitution of the United States of America, religion as well as race presents no hindrance to good American citizenship. A consistent Lutheran can be just as good an American as a convinced Romanist, Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist.

(7) "From theology we ought to return to pure religion"—this sentiment is to very many a motive for union. We have had occasion to touch upon this subject so much that we can dispose of most of what here should be said by referring to previous chapters. See our treatment of the thoughts of Calixtus on this question in the *Lutheran Quarterly*, July 1919, pp. 372ff., cf. pp. 379 ff.; in our special print pp. 89, cf. 96. On his suggestion to establish the union on the basis of the Apostles Creed, see *Luth. Quarterly* pp. 370 ff. (our special print 87 ff.) Compare also our review of the *Consensus Repetitus* by Abr. Calovius in the same issue of the *Quarterly*, pp. 388 ff. (reprint 105 ff.). We further refer to the thoughts of the "union theologians" of the middle of the last century, especially J. Mueller and C. I. Nitzsch (*Quarterly* 1919, p. 546; special print p. 129) and to the position of the German Evangelical Synod as discussed

in chapter VI, sec. III, note 2. *In abstracto*, and with proper care of expression also *in concreto*, it is legitimate to distinguish between pure religion and theology. Yet in the manner in which this distinction is used by many advocates of church union there is something misleading. They overlook that after all theology is indispensable to indicate, to express, and to communicate religion to the minds of men, and *that it depends upon the contents of this theology whether the religion which is communicated is pure or adulterated, true or false, Scriptural or un-Scriptural.*

It is interesting to note the practical identity of the sentiment here under discussion in other suggestions which operate as motives for union. We are admonished: "From Luther and Calvin we must come back to Christ." It is about the same as when we hear: "From the Lutheran and the Reformed Confessions we appeal to the Scriptures."<sup>13</sup> The "Disciples" (Christian Church) admonish the denominations to "return to the beliefs and practices of the Church in the New Testament times."<sup>14</sup> To find out what this is we have to turn to the New Testament itself. But what is the teaching of the New Testament? Is it not on the New Testament teaching that the churches disagree? From the New Testament times up to our day the Church has studied the Scriptures, to discover their message for the individual unto his salvation and for the Church as entrusted with the spiritual feeding of souls. This has naturally yielded to the Church of to-day a doctrinal experience. This experience which we can trace through the history of dogma has not been the same in all churches, because in some cases misleading principles were permitted to furnish viewpoints which made it impossible to do justice to the whole body of Scripture truth. The Lutheran Church claims neither infallibility nor perfection. Her teaching is true only in so far (quatenus) as her Creed actually agrees with the Scriptures. But the individual Luther-

<sup>13</sup> Cf. chapter VI, sec. III, 2.

<sup>14</sup> P. Ainslie, "Towards Christian Unity," p. 11.

an, especially as a teacher in his church, is a Lutheran, because (*quia*) he believes that his Confession is Scriptural.<sup>15</sup> Members of the churches differing from the Lutheran Church ought to take the same position. We know that many do—such men, for instance, as the late Dr. B. Warfield of Princeton. But we know also that there is a strong sentiment of indifferentism in the Reformed churches: Creeds are discredited, instead of confessional conviction there is only religious opinion, subject to change with the theological schools of the age. We are speaking here from the standpoint of the men of religious conviction, who are convinced that the teaching of their Confession is Scriptural. Such men feel that we need to have confidence in the doctrinal experience of the Church as it has embodied itself in the Confessions of history. And any new truth must be built on the old basis. Now the advocates of union tell us: "From theology you must go back to religion," "from the Confessions back to the Scriptures," "from Luther and Calvin back to Christ." What do these suggestions mean? Considering their source, they can mean only that we must disown the doctrinal experience of the Church and return to the beginnings of its history with a *nescimus*. The full-grown man, equipped with the doctrinal experience of a rich history is to return to the state of development of the child whose mind on definite beliefs is yet a blank. And what then? Is the development to be started over again? No, we are simply to establish ourselves upon the "Scriptures" (refusing to interpret them confessionally), upon "Christ," upon "pure religion," and then the dream of an all-inclusive union will be a glorious reality! But can a church, by stepping into organic union with other churches, on the basis of Confessional agnosticism, forget what it does know? The Church certainly did learn something from the writings of the Reformers. Some of their books are immortal. Supposing that in the spirit of indifferentism

15 Cf. chapter VI, sec. III, 3, note 1.

we enter into such an organic union, can we forget the historical Creeds? Will the conflicting principles of the Lutheran and the Reformed Creeds and the great theologies that have been built upon them cease to function and continue to be dead?

We do not know what may be possible among the Reformed churches. Their genius is different from that of the Lutheran Church. Their attitude to Creeds is not the same. The Lutherans are established upon "Symbols" which are the same the world over; the Reformed have "Confessions" which are different in the different countries. And it may also be said that the differences between the Reformed churches are of a less essential nature than those existing between them and the Lutherans. So the Reformed churches may succeed in a union on the basis of indifferentism to the doctrines that have divided them. But from what we know of the history of the Lutheran Church and of the functioning of Lutheranism in a free country we cannot believe that the time will ever come when the Lutheran Church will step into a church union that is not established upon a careful agreement in matters of faith. The Lutheran Church of the future, we believe, cannot and will not refuse to participate in conferences for union, provided there is the assurance that the matters of faith and doctrine shall have fundamental consideration. But in such doctrinal conferences it must not be expected that the differences can be settled by mutual concessions. Recently we saw Dr. Burrell quoted to have said: "On truth you cannot split the difference."

### III. *The Persistency of the Difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism.*

We are speaking of a union in which the Lutheran Church is expected to participate. As soon as the Lutheran Church is to be included there are difficulties in the way of a union, which are absent when the Reformed churches alone are considered. There was no malice in the words of Luther when he said to Zwingli: "Ye have

another spirit than we"; he simply stated an actual situation. The Lutheran and the Reformed Church differed from the beginning on the relation of the divine to the human in the Word, in Baptism and Lord's Supper, in the person of Christ, in the conception of the Church and in much pertaining to the way of salvation. Let us look at the tenacity of this difference from two standpoints: first, by a brief review of the union movements; and, second, by calling to our attention the sensitiveness of Lutheranism when exposed to modifying influences calculated to lead to a union with the Reformed church family.

1. *Union movements that have failed.* We shall content ourselves with a very brief review and refer to the chapters which contain the more extended discussion.

(a) Martin Bucer, the great union theologian of the Reformation age, succeeded in drawing Luther into a union movement. The "Wittenberg Concord," in which the two sides had agreed, was mildly Lutheran and was for that reason not accepted by the Swiss. Calvin remoulded the followers of Zwingli. Luther published his Last Confession on the Lord's Supper, and the Wittenberg Concord ceased to function.<sup>16</sup>

(b) Melanchthon who felt himself drawn to Calvin was desirous of a union between the followers of Luther and those of Zwingli. To this purpose he changed two significant expressions in Art. X of the Augsburg Confession—in the edition of 1540 (*Variata*),—which was to make it easier for the Zwinglians to identify themselves with the Lutherans. But after the death of Luther the *Variata* was discredited. And the Lutheran Church, in adopting the Book of Concord, established herself upon the first edition of the Augsburg Confession which, together with the Formula of Concord, was to preserve an uncompromising position upon the teaching of Luther as opposed to the modifications proposed by Melanchthon.

(c) After the final split of Protestantism into a Luth-

<sup>16</sup> See our chapter I, especially the closing observations.

eran and a Reformed Church effort after effort was made to heal this schism. In chapters III and IV we have studied the following union movements: (1) the Consensus of Sendomir (1580); (2) the Montbeliard Colloquy (1586); (3) the Palatinate Irenicum (1606); (4) the advance of Paraeus (1614); (5) the Colloquy at Leipzig (1632); (6) the convention at Thorn (1645); (7) the Colloquy at Cassel (1661); (8) the Colloquy at Berlin (1662); (9) the life work of John Dury; (10) the principles of George Calixtus. All these movements failed. The best contribution to a real understanding was made by the Leipzig Colloquy because here the doctrinal differences were discussed with thoroughness and frankness. For a characterization of these movements as a whole we must refer to the introduction of chapter III.

(d) The union movements of the nineteenth century in Germany brought only a partial success (cf. chapter V). The aim of the Prussian king was "a renewed Evangelical Christian Church"; but the outcome was a mere confederation of two churches which both continued to maintain their identity. But even this had to be forced by the state authorities. Such a union was possible in Germany because in most of the dominions one of the churches was overwhelmingly in the majority. So to that church could be given almost exclusive recognition. Such an arrangement would not in any way be transferable to American conditions. Here a mere confederation, in an organic union, is bound to issue into an *absorptive* church union in which the Lutheran Church would be sure to lose her identity and with that her heritage and her mission. If the Prussian Church Union had succeeded in finding the consensus of the two churches then there would have been the positive contribution to a basis for union, upon which the Protestant churches of America, the Lutherans incuded, might find themselves together. But the consensus theory of the old "union theologians" (Mueller, Nitzsch, Dorner, Rothe, Ullmann)

was a phantom which they kept chasing until in 1846 it vanished definitely out of sight (cf. p. 130).

(e) The German Evangelical Synod of North America which we have studied in chapter VI, represents an attempt to unite Lutherans and German Reformed in one body. The Lutherans in this body are by far in the majority. Under our American conditions the adherents of both Confessions are expected to live in one congregation, instead of separately under a common general government. So the German Evangelical Synod had to find a confessional platform that would be agreeable to both sides. Profiting from the experiences of Germany, the search for a consensus of doctrine between Lutherans and Reformed was abandoned. In its place a confessional basis was arrived at, which may be said to present a kind of a selection ("Chrestomathie") of what seemed best adapted to meet the needs of the constituent parts of the Synod. From all that we know of Lutheranism when it functions in freedom from the state, the Lutherans of America will never be ready to join in such a plan of union. Therefore, when the consideration is a union of American Protestantism, in which the Lutheran Church is to participate, we have to record also the attempt of the German Evangelical Synod among the failures. We must ask to read again what we wrote in the closing section (5) of chapter VI.

2. *Can Lutheranism be expected to change?* As has been said already, there are obstacles in the way of union when the Lutheran Church is considered as a participant, which are absent when a union of the rest of the churches of Protestantism is under consideration. The latter belong to one family while the Lutheran Church is in a different class. It is this observation that suggests our question which we shall now express in this form: Can we look for a change in the Lutheran Church of America, especially with regard to her appreciation of the doctrinal element, that will lead to a union such as is demanded by most of the advocates of organic union in our day? In attempting to answer this question we can

speak with profit only by again consulting history. Our references must be first to Germany and then to America.

(a) We are told that in the land of Luther the differences between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches have dropped into the background and are disappearing more and more in this age of reconstruction. But there are a number of things, that must be taken into account, which will guard us against drawing hasty conclusions.

(1) Liberalism with its large following in Germany (in and outside of the Union) naturally has no appreciation of confessional differences such as existed between the Reformers of the sixteenth century. One like Albr. Ritschl, late professor at Goettingen, (the university of a Lutheran province), who, in the succession of Schleiermacher, made man's subjective experience the criterion of what is to be accepted as Scripture truth naturally could see no objection to a union between Lutherans and Reformed. And there are no difficulties in the way of union for the men of the school of comparative religion which at present holds the field of liberalistic theology in Germany. As mere products of evolution certainly one church is as good as the other. The Scriptures have no proving value. (2) Then the training of ministers in the university, instead of in real church schools, is another factor to explain much of the confessional indifferentism in Germany. All confessional and theological Richtungen have equal right, and in most branches of theology the confessional character of teaching is entirely absent. There is no applicability of German conditions to the denominational situation in America. (3) And yet, confessional Lutheranism is far from being dead in Germany. Even under the adverse state church conditions it has shown a wonderful vitality. After its breakdown in the age of rationalism, the second third of the last century brought a revival of Lutheran theology which received its impulses from the struggle against both rationalism and the Union. We refer to names such as Sartorius, Rudelbach, Guericke, Harless, Thomasius, Philippi, Th. Harnack, Caspari, Kurtz,

Kliefoth, Vilmar, von Zezschwitz, Oehler, Hofmann, Delitzsch, Kohnis, Keil, Luthardt, Zoeckler. And in the Modern Positive School of to-day, which has followed the Erlangen School, there is a very large representation of Lutheranism. Including the names of some that have passed away in recent years and aiming neither at completeness nor at systematic grouping, we mention writers such as the following:<sup>17</sup> Ihmels, Zahn, Kaftan, Walther, Hilbert, Noesgen, Roemer, von Bezzel, Klostermann, Wohlenberg, Dunkmann, Bachmann, Althaus, Boehmer, Preuss, Leipolt, Schaeder, Uhlhorn, Zaenker, Laible, Bestmann, Kropatscheck, Stange, Kunze, Schultze; and churchmen such as Bard, Haack, Veit, Bracker, Paul, Oepke, Haccius, Glage, Matthes, Wetzel and so many more that it is simply impossible to mention them. These names certainly represent an influence! But we want to emphasize that back of such outstanding leaders there are in the congregations of Germany very many ministers of the Gospel who are all established upon the principles of the Augsburg Confession and after the experiences of the last century are distrustful of a confessional union. (4) We admit that in the church reconstruction of Germany, at this present time, there is much inconsistency ("Gleichberechtigung der Richtungen"). But this has chief reference to liberalism. The church in Germany faces the double problem of the extreme poverty of the country and the general hostility of Socialism to the Church. Under these circumstances the leaders of the Church seem to feel that separate organization along the lines of distinguishing principles, at the present time, would make all church organization impossible.

Our conclusion then, is that, considering the whole situation, the lessons from Germany do not point to the coming of a fundamental modification of historic Luther-

17 In giving these names we have not overlooked that many men of this school, as a result of the German university conditions, go too far in their emphasis upon the human factor of the Holy Scriptures. Yet the Bible is to them normative for Christian doctrine, and they are opposed to the union principle.

anism by erasing the confessional difference between Lutherans and Reformed in the practical church life. The fact is that the union features of Germany have no applicability to conditions in America. In Germany even the Union in so very many of its evangelical representatives is so overwhelmingly Lutheran that the union features there do not mean what they would mean here. Co-operation and confederation in Germany can be practiced without the effects they would have in America.

(b) Can we look for a change of the Lutheran Church in America confessionally? The rapidly proceeding development into the English and the process of Americanization are bound to influence the Church. Will these things induce the Lutheran Church of this country to lessen her emphasis upon doctrinal truth and to approach the churches of the Reformed group? Young as we are in experiences as a church on this continent we have already had our own history on this subject. During a number of decades in the history of the old General Synod the attempt was made to establish for the English Lutheran Church of America a "Lutheranism modified by the Puritan element," an "American Lutheranism," as it was called.<sup>18</sup> The appeal was to Melancthon and to the principles of the Variata edition of the Augsburg Confession and to the Pietistic School in Germany. The movement was characterized by participation in the revivals of the denominations and much practice of pulpit and altar fellowship with the other churches. It even led to the drafting of a confessional document, the "Definite Synodical Platform,"—a new Variata of the Augsburg Confession,—which was proposed as a basis for an "American Lutheranism." The distinguishing features of the Lutheran Church, such as Baptismal regeneration, the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper, were removed. The most influential men of the General Synod stood back of the movement: Dr. S. S. Schmucker, President of the Gettysburg Seminary (prominent in the organiza-

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Neve, *Brief History of the Luth. Church in America*, second edition, 1916, pp. 103-176.

tion of the Evangelical Alliance in London), Dr. S. Sprecher, President of Wittenberg College, and Dr. B. Kurtz, for over thirty years editor of the *Lutheran Observer*. Synods under names such as "Frankean Synod," "Melancthon Synod" were called into existence. The movement was remarkable for the energy with which it set itself to work to accomplish its purpose. The whole literature on the history of the Reformation was searched for material in favor of Melancthonism and against the principles of historic Lutheranism as expressed in the "unaltered" Augsburg Confession and in the Formula of Concord.<sup>19</sup> We refer to the many articles on this conflict in the "*Lutheran Observer*," the "*Lutheran World*," the "*Lutheran Evangelist*" and in the "*Lutheran Quarterly*."<sup>20</sup> But all these efforts could not keep the Lutheran Church in America (the part of it that had developed into the English) from asserting her own genius. The time came after much struggle when the General Synod established itself upon the "unaltered" Augsburg Confession and recognized "the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, the Small Catechism of Luther, the Large Catechism of Luther and the Formula of Concord as expositions of Lutheran Doctrine of great historical and interpretative value."<sup>21</sup> After this position had been taken by the old General Synod the way was open for a union of all the English speaking bodies of the Lutheran Church in this country.

Will the Lutheran Church in America change? Can we expect in her future development an approach to the positions of the Reformed church family? Certainly,

19 Cf. Neve, *Introduction to Lutheran Symbolics*, p. 98 f.: "Why does the Lutheran Church of to-day insist upon a subscription to the unaltered Augsburg Confession?" A more extensive discussion of this subject is given in the same author's publication: "Are we justified in distinguishing between an altered and an unaltered Augsburg Confession?" (*Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa*).

20 The "Confessional History of the Lutheran Church" by Prof. Dr. J. W. Richard, championed the Melancthonian and "The Confessional Principle" by Drs. Schmauk and Benze the Lutheran side of the question.

21 See Neve, *History*, as cited, pp. 176-84.

the history of Lutheranism in America gives no such encouragement. The development which we have described was the history of the *English* Lutherans in this country. And they arrived at their present position *after a long period of visiting with the Puritans and the Methodists*. Dr. S. Sprecher, one of the chief promoters of the "American Lutheranism," wrote in old age (1890): "No church can give up its creed. I thought at one time that a Lutheranism modified by the Puritan element would be desirable, but I have given up its desirableness, and I am convinced of its hopelessness."<sup>22</sup> To-day the English Lutherans in America in their recognized church literature, are thoroughly established upon the historic positions of the Lutheran Church. Special evidence of this can be seen in their order of service, in their hymnbook, in their forms for ministerial acts, in their Catechism. At present they are even engaged in the creation of an independent system for Sunday School teaching, arranged after the church year as observed in the Lutheran Church.

When the conflict over the "American Lutheranism" was at its height Dr. E. J. Wolf, professor in the Gettysburg Seminary, published in the "Lutheran Evangelist" (1910), then edited by Dr. S. A. Ort, a series of articles on "Melancthonian Lutheranism," which were so pertinent to our discussion that we cannot resist the temptation to quote at least a few paragraphs:

"The whole history of Melancthonian Lutheranism shows it to be lacking in the element of permanency. It has no staying quality. With all the advantages of circumstances and leadership, with the popularity which is generally claimed for liberal views over against rigid orthodoxy, it has proved incapable of holding its own, incapable of self-propagation, which is the first essential of all true life. It comes forth with much promise, it contains some very specious features, it seems to commend itself especially to Americans, but it is ephemeral.

<sup>22</sup> Quoted by Dr. E. J. Wolf in the "Lutheran Evangelist," April 10, 1891.

The spirit, the tendency, the school has no future, it has never succeeded in embodying itself in a permanent form. It has never become a distinct branch of the Church. It either rebounds to pure, historic Lutheranism, or it bounds off to Presbyterianism, Methodism or some other ecclesiastical species. It soon develops to a point where it is found necessary to be one thing or the other, where one must be either for or against the intact Lutheran system, where one must either come out as a Lutheran or decide to be something else.<sup>23</sup> A middle ground between historic Lutheranism and the position of the other churches, a firm rock between two opposing Protestant systems, in which one can shout the "Hier stehe ich," has never been reached.

"Such are the facts. Their explanation is as easy as the collection of the facts. The Lutheran faith is a body of truth so Scriptural, so logical, so rounded, so organic and symmetrical in its development, that the rejection of any part of it mars and mutilates the whole, and renders it utterly unsatisfactory. Possibly not every stone in a gothic cathedral is essential to it, but if you remove a block here, a buttress there, and a pillar yonder, if you substitute in places brick, stucco or wood for the original marble, the glory of the building is gone, its strength is undermined, its stability endangered.

"Lutheranism is a system. So is Calvinism..... Each has a vitality that has withstood the storm of the ages. The two have much in common, and at many points they coincide, but when you attempt to alter either system or both so as to combine the two, you destroy both, without being able to form a new structure from the ruins. The result is disorganization. Building theo-

<sup>23</sup> While this may have been the experience of history in general yet we think there have been seeming exceptions: The Prussian Church Union, the Moravian Church, the German Evangelical Synod in America. It may be replied, however, that in Prussia the Union failed to become a real absorptive Union; that the Moravians and the men of the German Evangelical Synod were the most insisting upon the organic union proposed in the movement discussed in sec. I of this chapter, in which they would soon have lost their identity. And compare our observation in chapter VI, sec. III, 5, close.

logical systems is not a matter of arbitrary mechanical exploit. Truth, like every other life-force, is organic and organizing, and when once the normal basis is laid down, the structure grows by virtue of inherent laws. That Melancthonism is irreconcilable with Lutheranism was decisively shown in the preparation of the Form of Concord. Chemnitz and Selnecker were the ablest representatives that school ever had, but before the document was completed, which settled the distracting controversies of the Church, every trace of the Melancthonian tendency disappeared. It is as impracticable in theology as it is in nature to cross the species. The hybrid does not propagate itself. The mongrel has no successors."<sup>24</sup>

The tenacity of the confessional difference between the churches of Luther and Calvin certainly gives food for thought. The "other spirit" of which Luther spoke at Marburg is not something imaginary, but is a reality. At the foundation of it there is a different conception of Scripture truth. From this as the centre, the difference has worked itself out into the cultus, the piety and the polity of the two churches.<sup>25</sup> Think of the efforts of almost four centuries that have been spent in overcoming this difference! It is the barrier of Union to-day as it was between Luther and Zwingli, between Calvin and the Lutherans of his day.

\* \* \*

It is no wonder that many have given up hope for a doctrinal Union. Large is the number of those that call for a Union in spite of the existing difference. They want a confederation of churches. They say: Let each church keep its doctrinal and practical peculiarities, but let them federate like the states of our Union in one common government. This, then, would be an organic form

<sup>24</sup> Lutheran Evangelist, April 10, 1891.

<sup>25</sup> All Protestant churches outside of the Lutheran, irrespective of their attitude to predestination, belong to the Calvinistic camp in so far as they all reject the Lutheran doctrine of the means of grace. It is in this field fundamentally where they cannot agree with Lutheranism.

of church federation. It takes us back to the Plan of Organic Union of Christian Churches, which was started by the Presbyterians and to which we referred. The suggestion of organic union in spite of doctrinal differences has, as a rule, the strong support of liberalism. The liberalists in the Presbyterian Church were the special promoters of this movement for organic union of the churches. But soon there was decided protest in that body. Most of the presbyteries voted against the "Plan", and so it failed in the Presbyterian Church. The Baptists also voted it down. The Methodists have their interest in the "family union." The movement is bound to end in failure.

At a recent convention of this movement for organic union in Philadelphia (Febr. 1920), Dr. Geo. W. Richards, Professor in the Reformed Seminary in Lancaster, Pa., an ardent advocate of the "Plan," made a very interesting statement. He said:

"The genius of a church is manifested through its doctrine, cultus, polity and piety. Points of agreement and difference between the churches would relate to these four aspects of organization and life. The plan of union leaves intact the doctrine, the cultus and the piety of the church, but it requires the modification of the polity, and in due time such modification in polity will affect also the piety, the cultus and doctrine. Yet such effect will be almost imperceptible, and will be wrought in course of a long time.

"In adopting this plan a church will begin to cease to be what it was *and will begin to become what it was not*. This is the surest proof that the plan calls for more than federal and nothing less than eventual organic union."<sup>28</sup>

How would such a gradual, "almost imperceptible" development affect the Lutheran Church if she should make herself a part of the organization? She would be unable to resist the stream of mediating and equalizing influences, she would very soon cease to be what she was

and thus lose her heritage and her trust. But it is needless to ask the question. As we know the mind of the Lutheran Church of America, in the German, the Scandinavian, the English quarters, we feel convinced that the time will never come when the Lutheran Church will go into organic union with the Reformed group of churches or with any church and leave the matter of doctrine and practice to a development of the future.

It is outside of our plan to discuss forms of church federation, that do not call for organic union. For this reason we have resisted the temptation of discussing the "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America," which comprises most of the Protestant churches in America, but in which the Lutherans are not represented.

*Springfield, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE V.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT

(From the July Quarterlies)

BY J. A. SINGMASTER.

## THE AUTONOMY OF THE INDIVIDUAL CONSCIENCE

Dr. Francis L. Patton delivered a Memorial Address on the late Dr. Benjamin B. Warfield of Princeton Seminary, one of the greatest of American divines, who died last Spring. The address is replete with truth. It is published in the *Princeton Theological Review*. We quote the following passage on Conscience.

A great principle which follows from the Protestant doctrine of the rule of faith is the autonomy of the individual conscience. If in regard to those matters which are revealed we assert the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, then by a very natural inference we may assume the same right in regard to subjects which are matters of specific revelation. It may, however, be said that it is in precisely such questions that the Christian consciousness has a right to speak authoritatively and to a certain extent supplement the teachings of the Bible. Those, however, who know how this principle has been abused will be slow to accept it, and will find their refusal to accept it abundantly justified by reference to the Scripture itself. Of course one should have good reason for dissenting from the prevailing opinion of the Christian Church, and one may well interrogate his own conscience in respect to the correctness of judgments which are at variance with the voice of Christendom. But nothing can lessen his own responsibility for deciding his own course of action in regard to things indifferent or which become right or

wrong according to circumstances "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind". You have liberty, says the Apostle, but use it well and see that you use it in accordance with the great altruistic principle, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." But the doctrine of the Christian consciousness cannot set aside the great truth regarding the autonomy of the conscience. One cannot well believe that the Holy Spirit has inspired His Church or any portion of it to contradict what He had previously inspired His apostles to write. We may think that our neighbor has erred in respect to matters which fall within the jurisdiction of the individual conscience, but even in the act of pointing out what we esteem to be an error we must heed the principle embodied in the Apostle's words, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth". No one can share with the individual Christian the responsibility of steering his own bark across life's stormy ocean. Let him avail himself of all the recognized aids to navigation, chart, compass, sextant, and chronometer, but when the critical moment comes it is for him to say whether he will "lay to" or "run before the wind."

#### THE RESHAPING OF THE SOCIAL ORDER

From a translation in the *Hibbert Journal* of an article on "Spiritual Life—Civil Rights—Industrial Rights" by Dr. Rudolph Steiner, we take the following:

Most people today still lack faith in the possibility of establishing a commonwealth based on the individual wills. They have no faith in it, because such a faith cannot come from a spiritual life that has developed in dependence on the life of the State and of industrial economy. The kind of spirit that develops, not in freedom out of the life of the spirit itself but out of an exterior organization, simply does not know what the potentialities of the spirit are. It looks round for something

to guide and manage it—not knowing how the spirit guides and manages itself, if only it can draw its strength from its own sources. It would like to have a board of management for the spirit as a sort of branch department of the economic and civil organizations, quite regardless of the fact that industrial economy and the system of rights can only live when permeated with the spirit that follows its own leading.

For the reshaping of the social order, good will alone is not the only thing needful. It needs also that courage which can be a match for the lack of faith in the Spirit's power. A true spiritual conception can inspire this courage; for such a spiritual conception feels able to bring forth ideas that not only serve to give the soul its inward orientation, but which, in their very birth, bring with them the seeds of life's practical configuration. The will to go down into the deep places of the spirit can become a will so strong as to bear a part in everything that man performs.

#### GOD THE ABSOLUTE SPIRIT

From an article in the *Hibbert Journal* on "Morals and Religion" by Professor H. Wildon Carr we quote a paragraph in the nature of an apologetic.

I conceive the absolute as life, essential and fundamental activity, activity which is not adjective, but substance. From life we can deduce matter, because matter is a diminution of life. Also matter can take the aspect of a reality independent of life, because we can take abstract and partial views of our activity from our standpoint of acting centre of activity. To continue the metaphysical argument, however, would be to risk condensing it to the point of unintelligibility, so I will simply say, that when I reflect on the reality of my own life, I find its ultimate principle to be spirit, not matter. Spirit is the continuity of a duration, not the continuity of an extension, and, however, obstinately matter confronts me as an alien existence, its reality is always partial

and abstract, while the reality of spirit is concrete and universal. What, then, is my relation to God? I reply that it is clear to me, when I reflect on my own life and its expression in actions, that the force which is there finding expression is not adventitious, not an apparition, not imposed from without, for the plain and evident reason that what is acting in the present is the whole of the past. The reality of my life is its history, which does not begin with my birth as an individual. My life is not continuous (in the precise mathematical meaning of the term) with past and present generations of living beings, but it is one and continuous with the acting principle which has been and is expressing itself in those generations. The universal spirit finding expression always and everywhere is God.

#### MODERNISM IN ITALY

Prof. Ernesto Buonaiuti, of the Royal University, Rome, in writing in the *Hibbert Journal* on "Religion and Culture in Italy" concludes by saying:

When we consider the far-reaching implications of this problem, which assuredly underlies and guides the spread of scholarly research into religious history and philosophy amongst us, and when we contemplate the stupendous issues that are ultimately involved, we can well understand, and from a certain point of view even sympathize with, the keen alarm which has moved the supreme authorities of Catholicism to oppose the dykes of their anathemas and ostracisms against the waves. But how can a historical tradition that is really convinced of the legitimacy of its existence and its constitution have cause to dread, as if with a foregone conclusion, the inspection of its title-deeds, to the point of choking off by anticipation every suggestion that looks that way. It is altogether premature to attempt to define the precise consequences that the spread of religious studies in Italy may have for the rigid and coherent organism of Catholic thought and discipline; but most as-

surely its effect will not be confined to the academic world, but will react upon the religious consciousness and Christian dispositions of the masses. Yet before condemning in block a movement which is supported by a demand of the contemporary conscience that can neither be hushed nor resisted, the Catholic authorities should surely have asked themselves whether the attack they dread is not directed against a special dogmatic formulation of historical Christianity rather than against its inmost and imperishable essence. Does he who, instead of discussing the objections urged against his own ideas, launches anathemas against them, really give proof thereby of his courage and sense of intellectual security?

In any case, an open rupture has now taken place. On the one side stand the representatives of research in matters pertaining to religion, and the advocates of a transformed apologetic. On the other, the supreme direction of Catholic society. The curtain rises on a drama which cannot fail to arrest the strained attention of all who feel the importance of religion, and the value of its many-sided bearing upon the development of the whole spiritual life of man.

#### THE DUTY OF SCHOOLS TOWARD RELIGION

A headmaster of an English school in discussing in the *Hibbert Journal* "Religious Knowledge in Schools" gives the following practical suggestions.

First of all, we can teach the Bible constructively and reasonably, and in invoking its authority we are bound to show the vigorous use of reason and conscience.

Secondly, parents and masters can stimulate older boys to think about the meaning of personality; the personality of A and B; personality in general; characteristics of personality such as reason, will and love; a definition of personality as "self-realization plus a keen perception of other individualities". Then will come

thoughts about the personality of Jesus Christ and of God.

Thirdly, we can accustom boys in considering the idea of God to think of an immanent God rather than a transcendental God, that is, to think of an indwelling God. It is not difficult for them to think of a thought or idea dwelling in every man; it is not difficult for them to get the habit of thinking of an indwelling God. "Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"

Fourthly, we can strive for the ideal set out by the Master of Wellington College: "But all these scripture lessons, chapel services, and confirmation preparation will be powerless to produce a Christian education, if they be not held together by every lesson and by the whole life of the School. Industry and obedience, truthfulness and fidelity to duty, unselfishness and thoroughness, must form the soil without which no religious plant can grow; and these are taught and learned in the struggle with Latin prose, or mathematics, or French grammar, or scientific formulae; as well as in the cricket field, on the football ground, in the give and take, the pains and the pleasures of daily life."

#### LUTHER AT WORMS

The *Lutheran Church Review* (April) has an illuminating article by Dr. Henry E. Jacobs on "Luther and the Emperor," in which he gives the following estimate of Luther's attitude and words:

The full force of Luther's words, however grateful to the multitudes who crowded the city, and in ever-widening circles beyond it, required, like other great orations which have had vast historical results, the intervention of many years to be thoroughly understood. To the centuries that followed, they have been what Lincoln's Gettysburg oration is to the days in which we live, and to those which are to come. If not the starting point, they are, at least, the rallying cry for a new world-encom-

passing advance in historical progress. That brilliant company, arrayed in the dazzling insignia of each man's rank, secular and ecclesiastical, stood for what is most striking and impressive in worldly power and glory. They were the representatives of what claimed to be the highest and greatest in the times in which they lived, and for which they planned and acted. Never before had a peasant's son stood before an Emperor and his titled lords, to claim the rights of the individual against the tyranny of such vast institutions as those of both Church and State. And yet, however representative his act became, he makes his defense, not as the spokesman of any class or order, but as the individual Christian, bound by his conscience and God's law, as well as by the law of the land, to speak the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and as the oath-bound teacher of religion, who cannot suppress or mitigate what is contained in his commission. Surely the words: "Here I stand: I cannot do otherwise" are a correct interpretation of the scene, even though they did not close the defense which he made.

#### IMAGINATION IN RELIGION

The Rev. Frederick C. Spurr of London writes in the *Review and Expositor* of the use of the imagination. He says in part:

But chiefly, by means of imagination we reach the soul of things. The man without imagination is condemned to play with the surface things of life: he can never reach their depth, their soul. The interpreters of life from the early Hebrew writers downwards, through Bunyan to Maeterlinck, have been men of high imagination. Through their pictures we see reality. We never stumble at their parables, mistaking the form for the essence. We know what they mean. We understand in parable what they teach in parable. And if we are wise men we shall not trouble ourselves too seriously about translating into abstract terms what may be better

understood through pictures. There is a difference between a portrait painter and a photographer. Literalists, and all the fraternity of wooden minds, prefer the photographer. They aver that "the camera cannot lie" and that the instantaneous impression which light fixes upon the sensitive plate must be more exact than anything which a slow working artist can put upon canvas. They forget that any photograph records but one impression of a man's features. It is a momentary thing. What we see in the photograph is the expression worn by the sitter at one particular moment. In the next moment his features may wear a totally different aspect. Rarely can a photograph give the normal expression of any man. It is the artist who secures this by careful observation of the sitter's features at different times. The artist seeks the soul of the sitter and tries to express it in the normal expression upon his face. That is why a first class painted portrait must always be greater than the best work of the camera. The camera has no imagination: the painter has. Every artist who succeeds is an imaginative person—whether he be novelist, poet, musician, orator or preacher. No one ever reaches the soul of another person except through imagination. That is why "rationalism" is so sterile, so hard, so repellent. Its devotees lack the magic of seership.

#### EDUCATION ON THE MISSION FIELD

Dr. Paul Monroe of the Teachers' College, Columbia University speaks advisedly on Education, in *The International Review of Missions*.

This article is written with keen appreciation of the result of mission education in the past and the present, and in the hope that its ultimate aims may be realized in the future. It is written also under the assumption that these ultimate aims do not include the perpetuation of our denominational organization and sectarian differences among people for whom such differences can have little of the historical justification which they may have

with us; but under the assumption that the fundamental desire is to establish a native Christian Church which may assume as speedily as possible the entire task of Christianizing the culture of the whole people, and that these ends are to be secured through the Christianization of as many as possible of the individual participants of that culture. The writer also assumes that such peoples are entitled to make their own interpretation of Christianity in the light of their own culture, their own modes of thought and their own historic backgrounds. If Japan could assimilate all the essential elements of the material culture of western civilization in one or two generations, this does not seem an impossible task. It would also seem, in the light of Japanese experience, to be wiser to urge and assist such peoples to make their own organization and interpretation of Christianity than to insist that they must fit themselves into the peculiar and perhaps temporary moulds of existing western thought and organization.

#### PHILLIPS BROOKS

Dr. James Robertson Cameron, of Aberdeen, pays the following tribute to an illustrious American in the *Expositor*.

What was the secret of Phillips Brooks' success as a preacher? What gave his sermons—and gives them, even in their printed form—their immense power? This above all, that they are the voice of a great soul speaking to souls. They are not theological or religious essays tinged by the personality of the speaker. They are simply the most direct expression of that personality itself, a personality afire with the love of God, the love of truth, and the love of man. And the effectiveness of the sermons is increased by their method. Each is the exposition of some one definite idea.

## REVIVALISM

Peter G. Mode of the University of Chicago discusses "Revivalism as a Phase of Frontier Life" in the *Journal of Religion*. He accounts for the passing of Revivalism as follows:

A distinct change appears about the middle of the last century. Local revivals no longer abound as in the preceding fifty years. The Finney campaign stirred the larger centers, but much more after the fashion of the colonial awakenings, and the Moody campaign was largely confined to the cities. It is true, of course that since Moody's day thousands of churches still persist in the seasonal special efforts; nevertheless, the aggregate revivalistic effort of the last fifty years does not begin to compare proportionally with that of the earlier half of the century. Its persistence moreover, is especially in areas whose emergence from frontier conditions is comparatively recent. Urban communities have been showing increasing disposition to resort to methods more educational in character. The explanation of this change is not far to seek. Ministerial forces have become more adequate to the demands of religious leadership. The cultural cravings of the ministry have made itineracy increasingly distasteful. More elaborate academic training has given preachers an inclination and aptitude for the reasoned discourse rather than the emotional appeal. The wider range of human interests and the contacts among folks, even the most isolated, with community and national currents of thinking, have given a weirdness and unreality to appeals that once were compelling. The latent fear of the frontiersman so easily played upon by the "hell-fire damnation preacher" has given way before the complacency of the comfortable materialist.

## RELIGION AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Prof. H. W. Wright of the University of Manitoba be-

lieves that the world has not outgrown religion, but that the latter must be closely related to social life. He writes in the *Journal of Religion* as follows: . . . . .

An analysis of the present social situation shows us therefore that modern civilization so far from having outgrown religion stands in crying need of its inspiring and fortifying influence. The civilized world of today offers to Christian evangelism an unparalleled opportunity for service. Now, if ever, in its history humanity needs to be brought face to face with the alternatives of the Christian gospel. They are, moreover, the ancient, the enduring, alternatives of a life surrendered to the pursuit of selfish enjoyment which destroys the higher faculties of mind and soul, against a life devoted to the upbuilding of that personal community through which the spirit of God reveals itself in the associations of men. But these alternatives in order to hold the attention of men today must be interpreted in the light of the new social problems which are distinctive of our time, and of which previous ages knew nothing. We behold civilization now enacting the tragedy of unlimited resources for social improvement, paralyzed by confusion of counsel and infirmity of purpose. Now, if ever, the influence of religion is needed to clear the vision of mankind so they may see the larger good, and to strengthen and unify the motives which impel them to disinterested service.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT

IN GERMAN. BY PROF. J. L. NEVE, D.D.

WHY MANY OF THE COMMON PEOPLE LOST CONFIDENCE IN  
THE CHURCH.

It seems that with socialism there has grown up in Germany and all over Europe a most fanatical hatred against the Christian Church. I feel strongly convinced that the state-church arrangement which is now being abandoned in Germany is to a considerable degree responsible for this general aversion of the working people to the Church. The Church was too much an institution of the state with the task of holding people in line with the prevailing political system. The fact is that the people in all countries of Europe have had to struggle against the Church for every forward step in the direction of political freedom. The altars were expected to support the thrones!

## WHY THE GOVERNMENTS FAVORED CHURCH UNION

The princes always thought that the Church could best fulfill this task as a union Church, in Protestant countries as a Church in which the differences between Lutherans and Reformed are ignored. There was a political motive back of the union endeavors of the Hohenzollerns to establish the Prussian Church Union.

Have not the empires of the world always aimed at a unified religion? Nebuchadnezzar as an embodiment of his empire made himself an object of worship, and in the failing of Daniel and his friends to obey he saw a sin against the state. The Roman emperors expected the worship of the Christians as an expression of loyalty to the State. Theodosius the Great, in the Christian era, charged himself with watching over the unity of the

faith as standardized by the Nicene Creed, the rejection of which was regarded as treason. At Treves, in 385, the first death sentence on account of heresy was executed. Charles V, at the time of the Reformation, came to the diet at Augsburg (1530) to satisfy himself that the Lutherans did not teach anything against "the twelve articles"—(Apostles or Nicene Creed). Baumgarten, his biographer, has shown us that the chief motive for his stand against the new religion was his belief that the observance of one religion was indispensable for keeping the many peoples of his empire in an attitude of loyalty to the crown. Insistency upon Protestant union, at least in the governmental sphere, was part of the political program of the Hohenzollerns from Elector Sigismund up to Emperor William II.

#### PRESENT CONDITIONS IN GERMANY

For a long time the Lutherans in Germany resisted the Union. But the persistency of the efforts to the contrary through the centuries brought results which are seen now in this present age of reconstruction. Think of it: in Thuringia, the homeland of Luther, the Augsburg Confession was rejected in the foundation of the new Church! A like position was taken by the Church of Wuerttemberg. The official Church of Hamburg to-day, where once Bugenhagen laid the foundation, is no longer a Lutheran Church. Liberalism is largely responsible for all this, and it favors the Union as helpful to its ends. I do not close my eyes to the sad economic conditions which make it hard for Church people in Germany to establish themselves in independent organizations to be supported by those faithful to the principles of historic Lutheranism. But it is impossible to found with permanency a Church upon contradictions. The old and the new faith cannot blend in one conviction. We have churches in America which are trying this thing. But they are sickly. They are lame in their work. Some are drifting head-long into Unitarianism; others which

have yet among them men of the old faith who assert themselves with persistent testimony, are facing a break.

#### LUTHERANISM IN AMERICA

In the development of Lutheranism in America it can be seen that the old confessional principles have the power to build a church, even in these days of modernism. Recently there met in Washington, D. C., the United Lutheran Church in America in which there were represented 2,841 pastors of 3,427 churches with one million baptized members. This is only one of the general bodies of America Lutheranism, namely the one which comprises the English Lutherans, besides a part of the Germans. There is furthermore the Synodical Conference and its adherents, to which most of the Germans belong. And there are the large Scandinavian bodies, the Swedes, the Norwegians, the Danes, and there are also the Finns. Together, all these Lutheran synods represent 2,500,000 communicant members. All are established upon the principles of the Augsburg Confession. No evolution, in the rejectionable sense of that term, no destructive criticism is taught in their theological seminaries, and their pulpits are given to the preaching of the Gospel in its purity. The point I wanted to make is this: in America it is the churches with a definite faith that are prospering and winning the field, while the churches permeated by liberalism are constantly losing ground.

#### GERMANY WILL HAVE A LIKE EXPERIENCE

In this time of reconstruction in Germany, the beginning may be made with a "people's church" (Volkskirche). But the battles that are to be fought on such vital matters as religious instruction of the young, on the education of a ministry, etc., are bound to land the professors of the faith of the Reformation in a camp where they will meet with the people of the Free

Churches (Freikirchen). Dr. Kaftan wrote: "The free-church form will be the last choice (*ultima ratio*)."

Whether Free-Church or People's Church, one thing is essential: the church must be true to its historic confession and can not rest upon a compromise between the true Gospel and what is destructive of the Gospel. If such conditions should prevail as obtain in Thuringia, in Wuerttemberg and in Hamburg then there would be the spectacle of history that the people of the German Reformation have lost the great heritage of that Reformation!

#### WORDS OF LUTHER

Then the well-known words of Luther would come true: "If we then let things pass without thanking and honoring God it is to be feared that we have to suffer deeper darkness and more tribulation. Dear Germans, buy while the market is at the door; gather while the sun shines and there is good weather; make use of God's grace and His Word while you have it. For this you must know: God's Word and His grace are like a heavy shower, touching one place after another, never returning where it was before. It came down over the Jews; but gone is gone (*hin ist hin*), they have now nothing. Paul brought it to the Greeks; but gone is gone, now they have the Turk! Rome and the Latin race (*lateinisch Land*) have also had it; but gone is gone, they have now the pope. And ye Germans must not think that ye will always have it, for godlessness and contempt will drive it away."

#### DO WE IN AMERICA UNDERSTAND ?

I know what some in Germany are accustomed to say. They think that we in America are outside of the stream of development in the field of theological science and that we do not see the problems that are to be solved. But this is a mistake. We have been forced to study the schools of German thought, because we have their re-

representatives and advocates in our own country, and our theologians have to defend the theology of revelation against the liberalism imported from across the water.

#### MERIT AND FAULT OF GERMAN THEOLOGY

Our debt to German investigation in the field of theology is great, especially along the lines of history and philology. Without the fundamental work of the Germans many of our textbooks for the theological seminaries would be impossible. And also in the deep religious thought German theology is great. This is especially true of the work of many of the men of the modern positive school, who are writing in the *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* and related papers. I would not want to be without that influence upon my thinking. There is a wonderful charm to the positive theology in Germany that has its roots and its foundations in the theology of the Reformation. But, on the other hand, there is a theology in Germany that has lost all reverence for what is sacred. The Scriptures are treated as if they were in one class with the classics of the ages. The Christian religion is nothing but a man-made product of a human development. The findings of this theology on the problems of the Old Testament are to a very large extent absolutely worthless. The theologians of this school are a menace to the Church in all countries. This "modern" theology in Germany and wherever it has its followers has turned away from what is central and fundamental for the Church. There is in this theology nothing of that charm which characterized the works of Luthardt. We will always need a theology that can be preached. The modern man also longs for the Gospel as Luther understood it and as it has been fundamentally expressed in the Augsburg Confession and in Luther's Catechism.

Note: A large part of the foregoing article is from a letter of the author to a friend in Hamburg where it was published in a parish paper.

## ARTICLE VI.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

## APOLOGETICS

*Modernism and the Christian Faith.* By Dr. John Alfred Faulkner, Professor of Church History, Drew Theological Seminary. The Abingdon Press, 150 Fifth Ave., N. Y. Cloth. Pp. 308.

This is a timely volume from the pen of a distinguished scholar. He takes up some of the problems raised by so-called liberal theology and answers them in an irenic but no uncertain manner. He is not afraid "to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints" against those who deny any fixity in doctrine. His long experience, his profound learning, his good judgment and his unshaken faith in the deity of our Lord are his armor and weapons in this fight. Two chapters are devoted to the Authority and the Inspiration of the Scriptures, and a third to Miracles. Three more are given to "Jesus" in which he vindicates Him against the false theories of modern German criticism. The Atonement and The Trinity are set forth in present day language but in harmony with the old faith. The doctrine of Hell is defended as being not only biblical but reasonable.

There is a chapter on "Ritschl or Wesley" in which he expresses his belief that Ritschlianism, if carried out, would "emasculate evangelical Christianity, especially the Methodist branch of it". He alludes to the fact that theological seminaries in America are filled with professors with Ritschlian tendencies. Ritschl's vague teachings concerning Christ, giving him only the value of God, his idea of sin as limitation rather than transgression, his denial of an objective atonement, his perverted idea of faith as a living power, and his superficial view of Scripture are all at variance with Paul, Luther and Wesley.

We trust that Dr. Faulkner's book will have a wide circulation to counteract the rationalistic and hypercritical wave that threatens the Church. There are a few things in the book with which I do not agree, but in general it is wholesome and refreshing.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*What Christian Science Means and What We can Learn From It.* By James M. Campbell. The Abingdon Press, New York. Cloth. Pp. 182. Price, \$1.25 net.

This volume is not an attack, but an antidote. It regards Christian Science as a serious movement, not to be laughed out of court; although there is an unconscious humor in Christian Science. The author quotes many pathetic illustrations of the incalculable harm done by this false cult. It exposes its fallacy as a religion and a philosophy, scores the ignorance and the sordidness of Mrs. Eddy, and the untenable assumptions of her followers. Nevertheless, the author asserts that Christian Science "has transformed many lives; it has broken the chains of evil habit; it has restored to honored usefulness many moral derelicts, thus doing its share to make the world a better place in which to live." The present writer doubts all this. He looks upon Christian Science as a delusion and imposture, of which the volume before us gives convincing proof.

J. A. S.

*What and Where is God ?* A human answer to the deep religious cry of the modern soul. By Richard La Rue Swain, Ph.D. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. 1921. Cloth. Pp. 255.

This is an interesting record of a man's personal experience in finding and knowing God. It is written in a good colloquial style, and is replete with apologetic ideas. It is a good book to put into the hands of an honest doubter.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

#### EXEGESIS

*The Pastoral Epistles*, with Introduction, Text and Commentary. By R. St. John Parry, D.D. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Published at Cambridge University Press. For sale by G. P. Putnam's Sons, N. Y. Cloth. Pp. 269. 800.

The object of the present edition of the Pastoral Epistles—First and Second Timothy, and Titus—is to

institute a fresh inquiry into the critical and exegetical problems on which the question of their genuineness depends. This renewed study has only confirmed the conservative views hitherto held by Christian scholarship. The treatment is fresh and learned. The author finds that the presbyterial and episcopal offices to which Timothy was ordained were one in nature, the former being really the office, the latter a function. The volume concludes with a commentary, with the Greek text printed in full, and a minute exegesis of every verse. This is one of the latest and best of works on the Pastoral Epistles for the use of scholarly pastors.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Christianity According to St. Luke.* By the Rev. S. C. Carpenter, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Selwyn College, Cambridge. S. C. P. C. London. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. Cloth. 8 vo. Pp. 239.

This is a devout discussion of the many problems—historical, doctrinal and exegetical—connected with the Gospel according to St. Luke. The author is conservative in his views. To sound scholarship he adds sound judgment, which is after all good common sense. He accepts the story of the Virgin Birth as genuine and as inherent in Christ's supernatural life. The contents of the volume are happily arranged under three heads: The Background, The Portrait, The Workmanship. Under the last, he speaks of Luke as the Psychologist, The Artist, The Democrat, and The Universalist. He knew human nature, was skillful in depicting men and events, advocated and presented the rights of the poor as acknowledged by Christ, and proclaimed amnesty to all upon the conditions of the Gospel.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

#### HISTORY

*Erasmus and Luther, Their Attitude to Toleration.* By The Rev. Robert H. Murray, Litt.D. H. Blake Scholar in History, Trinity College, Dublin. S. P. C. K. London. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. Cloth, 8 vo. Pp. 503. Price 25 shillings net.

Dr. Murray has woven into the history of the German Reformation, the personal story of two mighty men—Erasmus, the Humanist and Luther, the Reformer. His

book is the result of much reading and is wider in scope than its sub-title indicates. Here and there he misunderstands the theology of the latter, but on the whole his appraisal is just. His attempt is to show how each of his heroes contributed to the thought and the act of toleration, in spite of apparent failure at times. "Erasmus and Luther had a special task to accomplish in preparing the way for toleration. The one contributed the mind that understands the many-sidedness of truth, the other contributed the energy which shook an intolerant institution to the foundations." Luther's words of intolerance are fierce: his deeds of intolerance are few. Erasmus according to the verdict of history looked into the promised land but did not have the courage to ford the flood which divided the dead past from the living future.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Beginnings of Christianity.* Part I. The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D., and Kirsopp Lake, D.D. Vol. I Prolegomena I. The Jewish, Gentile and Christian Background. Macmillan and Co., N. Y. and London. Cloth. 8 vo. Pp. 480. Price 18 shillings.

The purpose of the series, of which the first volume is before us, is to continue the work begun by the late Bishop Lightfoot in editing Christian documents historically as well as critically. His great contributions on the Pauline Epistles, Galatians, Colossians and Philemon and Philipians were succeeded by his masterly editions of the Ignatian literature and of Clement of Rome. It is now proposed to follow up these by an edition of the Acts of the Apostles in three volumes, and to extend the series down to the day when the Church obtained official recognition by the Roman Empire.

The present volume is historical, giving the Jewish, Gentile and Christian Backgrounds. The second volume of Prolegomena will deal with the literary criticism of Acts. The third volume will contain the Text and Commentary.

The work is composite in being composed of contributions of specialists, but the editors have used their discretion in adapting these contributions to the end in view and, therefore, acknowledge their responsibility for the whole. The Jewish, Gentile and Primitive Christian

Backgrounds are made to stand out in simple and strong colors. There are five appendices respectively on The Zealots, Nazarene and Nazareth, Pharisee and Sadducee Interpretations, and The Am-Ares (the people of the land) and the Habeirm (associates). A copious index completes the volume.

The Primitive Christian situation is presented by the editors who regard the gospels and Acts as purely human documents more or less contradictory. The great Confession as recorded by Matthew is not regarded "as the genuine saying of Jesus." The editor of the Acts is accused of manipulating facts in the interest of his own opinions. The editors also allege that "the claim of Christianity to be 'a faith once delivered to the saints' cannot bear the scrutiny of the historian of religions. To him it appears not a single religion but a complex of many, justified in claiming the name of Christianity by reason of the thread of historic continuity which runs through and connects its component parts." It is well to bear in mind the general attitude of the editors.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Religions of Mankind.* By Edmund Davidson Soper Professor of the History of Religion in Northwestern University. The Abingdon Press, N Y. Cloth. Pp. 344. Price \$3.00.

This is intended as a text-book, and it traverses the usual ground, beginning with a chapter on the Nature of Religion, with discussions on the definition, origin and development of religion. Religion is defined as a relationship of conscious dependence on higher powers, &c. Its origin is divine, but a primeval revelation is denied. Its first form is animistic. Of course this is purely presumptive. The several chapters take up Animism, the ancient historic religions, those of Persia, India, China and Japan, and then Judaism, Mohammedanism and Christianity. The last is the final and absolute religion.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The World's Student Christian Federation; Origin, Achievements, Forecast.* By John R. Mott. Published by the World's Student Christian Federation. For sale by the Association Press, 347 Madison Ave., New York. Price 50c paper.

This is a modest presentation of a great work done

during the last quarter of a century by the World's Student Federation. The first part gives the history and the second the outlook of the Federation. In 1895 six men came together in the historic castle built by Gustavus Vasa over 300 years ago at Vadstena on the shores of Lake Vättern to found the Federation which now embraces the universities and colleges of many lands. Within the movements now comprising the Federation there are approximately 2,500 associations with about 200,000 students and professors.

The cornerstone principle of the Federation is the recognition of the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour and God. A second principle is Christian unity, interdenominational and interconfessional, including the Greek and Roman Catholic churches. A third principle is the recognition of the autonomy of each national movement. A fourth principle is that of interdependence and mutual obligation of all the movements in the Federation. It is non-political in its aims, democratic in its government and worldwide in its purpose.

The Federation has already done much good in bringing together the present and future readers of the world and is destined to be of great usefulness in the crisis through which the world is passing.

J. A. S.

#### NEW TESTAMENT

*Jesus and Paul.* By Benjamin W. Bacon, Yale Divinity School. Lectures given at Manchester College, Oxford, 1920. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. Cloth. Pp. 251. Price \$2.50.

These very able and learned lectures by Dr. Bacon appeal chiefly to the technical scholar versed in New Testament criticism. Their purpose is to show that the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is untenable, both external and internal evidence being against it. Dr. Bacon calls it the Ephesian Gospel and ascribes its authorship to an unknown disciple of Paul, for it is essentially a Pauline gospel. It seems, however, quite certain that the traditional authorship of John will not be seriously disturbed. To the average Bible reader the Gospel of John seems like the very expression one might expect from the beloved disciple. At all events there can be no contradiction between Pauline and Johannine teaching.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Four Gospels, Their Literary History and their Special Characteristics.* By the Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D. Rector of Rotherfield Reppard. The Macmillan Co. N. Y. S. P. C. K. London. Cloth. Pp. 122.

These lectures were delivered at the Training School for Clergy and Sunday School Teachers in England. They are intended to set forth in a popular way the character and contents of the Gospels and some of the critical problems concerning authorship and authenticity.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

#### PHILOSOPHY

*Bergson and Personal Realism.* By Ralph Tyler Flewelling. The Abingdon Press, N. Y. Cloth. Pp. 304. Price net, \$2.00.

This critic of Bergson shows the deficiencies of his Philosophy of Religion in which personality is so obscured as to leave in doubt its very existence. The Personality of God, which to the plain intelligent Christian is the simple corollary of the personality of man, is not apparent to philosophy. Christianity, through revelation in the Bible and in personal experience, delivers the believer from the perplexities of unaided reason upon which philosophy must lean. A philosophy which gropes after God may be of use to the man who rejects the Scriptures, but the believer can get no help from it.

Professor Flewelling further endeavors to show that personal realism is the supreme metaphysical and spiritual reality. He is here on solid ground.

J. A. S.

#### PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

*Paul's Companions.* By David J. Burrell, D.D., LL.D. American Tract Society, New York. 12mo. 196 pages. Price \$1.25.

This choice volume is by the well known and long time pastor of the Marble Collegiate Church of New York City. Dr. Burrell is also the author of quite a number of previous books, notable among which is his volume on Homiletics published in 1913 under the title, "The Sermon: Its Construction and Delivery." This latest book is one of a trilogy on Paul, the titles of the other two being

"Paul's Campaigns," and "Paul's Letters." These books are all in Dr. Burrell's easy and familiar style and are enlivened by abundant illustrations, metaphors, anecdotes and parables. They will be especially welcome, and especially valuable just now when the Sunday Schools using the International Series of Lessons are busy with the study of the life and labors of St. Paul. There are fifteen chapters in this volume, each dealing with one of the men who labored with, or encouraged, comforted and helped the great Apostle to the Gentiles. Among the chapter headings are, "Barnabas: A Good Man," "John Mark: the Youth that Flinched," "Luke: the Beloved Physician," "Lydia: the Purple Seller," "Apollos: Mighty in the Scriptures," etc. The beginning of each chapter is faced by a short and pertinent selection from Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," because Dr. Burrell thinks that Bunyan may have drawn his characters from the Book of Acts. "In any case," he says, "they look alike."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Citizenship and Moral Reform.* By John W. Langdale.

The Abingdon Press, New York City. 12mo. 157 pages. Price \$1.25 net.

The following sentence from the Preface to this little volume well expresses both the spirit and the aim of the writer: "It is the aim of the author to represent to the mind, conscience, and heart of Christians their responsibility for promoting the righteousness, peace, and good will that are characteristic of the kingdom of heaven." This is just the lesson that a great many American citizens, and especially Christian American citizens need. They generally regard themselves as among the "best people" in the country, and they may be. But very often they are among the very worst of American citizens just because they do not realize the responsibilities of citizenship, and are criminally careless in meeting them. In his first chapter, on "The Call of Citizenship," the author says very truly and very justly, that in this country "the bad citizenship of otherwise good people has become a national sin," and again, "It is questionable whether it is more reprehensible to enter politics to make money than it is to remain aloof from politics from the same motive," and still again, "Legislators may misrepresent their constituencies, but they represent those who care enough to fight for their wishes." These few sentences will also

serve as a sample of the direct and effective way in which Mr. Langdale deals with his subjects. There are ten chapters in all, and some of the special problems dealt with are, Post-Prohibition Problems, The Family, The Abolition of Poverty, The New Criminology, Industrial Relations, etc. They are all approached from the point of view of the relation of the preacher as a Christian citizen and moral leader to these problems and other pending reforms.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Sermons on the Lord's Prayer.* By Robert Emory Golladay, D.D., Pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, Columbus, Ohio. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio. 8vo. 457 pages. Price \$2.50.

This is the third of Dr. Golladay's four projected volumes of sermons on the Catechism. The first one dealt with The Ten Commandments; the second one with The Creed. The fourth one will discuss the Sacraments.

The first two volumes have been previously reviewed in the QUARTERLY, and very highly commended, as they richly deserved. We might justly repeat of this third volume everything that was said in praise of the other two. Dr. Golladay's long experience as a successful Lutheran pastor, and his devotion to the work of catechization, have given him special preparation for such a task as he has now undertaken, and those who come after him will reap the benefit.

This volume contains thirty-two sermons. The first ten are a discussion of the subject of "Prayer in General," under such topics as "The Nature and the Need of Prayer," "Does God Answer Prayer?" "The Secret of Unanswered Prayer," "The Elements of Prayer," etc. The other twenty-two are on the Lord's Prayer more especially, taking it up petition by petition, and phrase by phrase, sometimes word by word. These sermons have the same excellent qualities which marked those of the preceding volumes. They are short, simple, direct, suggestive and helpful. They will prove especially valuable and helpful to pastors and others who are charged with the care of the young and with the work of instructing them in the fundamentals of our holy religion as Luther has so wisely arranged them in the Catechism.

We are pleased to note what the author says in the Preface in regard to the fourth volume: "Much of the work is complete. The remainder in process of prepara-

tion. If the good Lord continues to give me strength, and new duties do not arise, I hope to have it ready for publication by the close of the coming year." There is an appreciative Introduction by Professor Frank P. Manhart, D.D., of Susquehanna University.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*What Christianity Means to Me: A Spiritual Autobiography.* By Lyman Abbott. The Macmillan Company, New York City. 12mo. 194 pages. Price \$1.75.

For many years the name of Lyman Abbott has been a familiar one in the religious thought and life of this country. As writer, preacher, editor and especially as the successor of Henry Ward Beecher in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, he has filled a large place and an important and influential place among us. He was not only the successor of Beecher as pastor of Plymouth church, but he is in a large measure a disciple of Beecher in theology and in the interpretation of Christian truth and life. He very freely and very cheerfully recognizes this in many places in this volume. Indeed, in the very first chapter, he attributes his changed views of theology and of religion, that is changed from the old Calvinistic orthodoxy in which he had been trained in his youth, to his attendance on the preaching of Mr. Beecher when still quite a young man. Then, again, in a later chapter, he quotes a long passage from Mr. Beecher's account of his religious experience and intimates that this is also a very satisfactory account of his own experience.

Dr. Abbott does not dogmatize. He does not profess to be writing a treatise on theology. He does not claim to be giving an authoritative interpretation of the teaching or the life of Jesus. Indeed, he distinctly disclaims this. He aims only to tell what Christianity has come to mean to him now that he has passed his eighty-fifth year of life, more than sixty of which years he has spent in the study of the Bible and especially of the New Testament, and in the preaching of the gospel of Christ as he understood it and seeking to apply it to individual, social, industrial and even national and international life and affairs.

To quote his own words, he says: "I began the systematic study of the New Testament when I entered the ministry in 1860. Since that time I have been a student of one book, a follower of one Master. . . . Now that I have passed my eighty-fifth birthday, I attempt to set

down here, simply and clearly, what I believe is the message which Jesus Christ has brought into the world. This book has long lain in my mind. Its failings will not be due to lack of meditation; they will be due to the fact that no one man can tell all that Christianity means. He can only tell what Christianity means to him.... We know in fragments and we prophesy in fragments, says the Apostle Paul.... I am content to add my fragment."

Those who, in these days of destructive criticism and new theology, are still holding fast to the faith as they believe that it was once delivered to the saints, and as it is expressed in the long recognized and accepted creeds of the churches, will find a good many things in Dr. Abbott's interpretation of Christianity in which they will not be able to agree with him. Especially will this be the case when he comes to deal with such subjects as sin, and atonement, and regeneration, and justification. But Dr. Abbott is always reverent, always devout. He is a master of clear and beautiful thought and expression. Hence, even while disagreeing with him, the reader of this book will find in it many things to quicken thought, to stimulate devotion, and to make both Christ and His teachings more attractive and more meaningful.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Followers of the Marked Trail.* By Nannie Lee Frayser.

Abingdon Press, New York City. 12mo. 232 pages.

Price \$1.25 net. Postage extra.

Nothing could more clearly illustrate or more strongly emphasize the popularity of the new movement for the organization of week-day religious instruction than the many excellent helps for this kind of work which are being offered by numerous publishers. The Abingdon Press seems to be leading in this kind of work. The present volume is another of the Week-day School Series of Religious Education Texts being published by this house under the general editorship of Dr. David G. Downey. It is a very attractive volume also. There are thirty-two chapters. The first one is of an introductory character and calls attention to the many famous "trails" or great highways which are being opened all through the United States by state and federal aid, most of them following the roads which were made along the rude paths which were blazed through the forests and over the prairies and mountains by the pioneer settlers of this western continent. The remaining chapters tell the stories of the

great trail makers of the Bible, such as Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Elijah, Isaiah, and finally John the Baptist, Jesus and Paul. Each chapter aims to make the one character stand out very clearly and distinctly as a pioneer in some phase of religious experience or activity. The stories are all told in a way to interest and charm the children for whom they are evidently intended. We could wish that somehow the evangelical note might have been more pronounced, but any wise teacher could very easily give this feature more emphasis. The volume is greatly enriched by a number of very beautiful full page illustrations presenting such scenes as Rebekah at the Well, Jacob Meeting Esau, The Finding of Moses, Elijah Meeting Ahab, Hoffman's Boy-Christ, Paul at Miletus, etc

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Call to Unity.* By William T. Manning, S.T.D., D.C.L. The Macmillan Company. 12mo. 162 pp. \$2.00.

This volume is made up of four lectures delivered in 1920 on the Bedell Foundation at Kenyon College, a Protestant Episcopal institution located at Gambier, Ohio. It is a very interesting and forceful discussion of the subject of Christian unity, and is well worthy of careful reading and study. The recent election of the author as Bishop of New York gives additional importance to his views on this subject. The specific phases of the subject discussed in the four lectures are "The Call to Unity," "The Present Outlook for Unity," "The Approach to Unity," and "The Call to the Anglican Community."

The first lecture deals with the importance and obligation of Unity growing out of the manifest will of our Lord that his disciples should be one. The author of course recognizes the force of the arguments for Christian unity based on grounds of expediency, such as economy, more effective administration, and a more convincing testimony. But he says, "We fall far short of the truth and of its full claim upon us if we rest the case here. Our desire for unity has a deeper source, our hope for it a surer foundation than our own wisdom and judgment, our sense of loss through our divisions, or our feeling that unity would be practically advantageous. Unity is not merely some plan, or scheme, or vision of ours. The call to Unity is from Christ Himself, and there-

fore it comes with compelling power to all Christians, Catholic and Protestant alike."

The second lecture is largely devoted to a discussion of the present hopelessness of any union with the Roman Catholic Church because of the attitude taken by the Pope and his advisers, demanding a "complete surrender" on the part of Protestants, and also of the various movements looking towards unity with special stress on those that have originated in the Protestant Episcopal and the Anglican Churches. The author recognizes also the various movements towards union within those bodies that are naturally close of kin, and mentions especially the organization of the United Lutheran Church in America as a hopeful sign.

One brief paragraph in this lecture is worthy of quotation. The author insists that we must make a distinction between unity and uniformity, and recognize the fact that along with agreement in essentials there is room for wide disagreement in non-essentials—"A true unity must provide for great diversity of spiritual apprehension, experience and expression. Unity requires uniformity only in the things which are essential to common faith and life in Christ." Nevertheless, Dr. Manning says very truly, and this is the point we meant to emphasize, "But we shall not make progress towards unity by ignoring, or glossing over real difficulties. As Christians, we owe it to ourselves, to each other, and to Christ Our Lord, to bear clear witness to the truth as we have learned it in Him, and unity reached by any other method than this could result only in disappointment." This is almost the exact language used in the Washington Declaration on Principles of Lutheran Catholicity.

The third lecture, on "The Approach to Unity," is, we think, the most important one. In this lecture Dr. Manning discusses the principles on which Christian unity may be hoped for. We would be glad to quote a large part of this lecture, if there were space, but must content ourselves with a few brief extracts. For example, here is a word that is needed by many: "People of a practical, business-like type of mind often ask, somewhat impatiently, why there should be all this talk about unity. If we want unity all that we have to do, according to their view, is to forget our differences and get together, and the thing is done. This attitude strongly as it may commend itself to the man in the street, or the man on the train, does not, however, argue deep thought,

or close acquaintance with the problem. It is usually the position of those to whom all questions of Christian doctrine seem equally meaningless and unimportant. We are to agree on everything in general because no one longer believes in anything in particular. But this is not the path by which Christian unity is to be reached."

In this same lecture the author lays down three general principles which he says must guide and control in all movements towards unity. These are, first, "the principle of Christian loyalty. In loyalty to Christ we may not, even for the sake of unity, surrender, nor compromise the truth of the Gospel." The second is "the principle of Christian liberty. In loyalty to Christ we may not demand, as a condition of unity with our fellow Christians, anything that is not actually essential to Christian faith and life." "The third principle which must guide us in our approach towards unity is the principle of ecumenicity. We must have always in mind the ultimate ideal, the only and sufficient goal, the reunion of the whole Church of Christ throughout all the world. Nothing lower, nothing less, than this can satisfy us: for nothing less will fulfill the prayers of Jesus Christ."

The fourth lecture is interesting mainly because of its discussion of the differences between Catholics and Protestants in their views of the Church, the ministry, and the Sacraments, and also because of the claim made that the Anglican Church holds a kind of intermediary position between these two great divisions of the Christian Church, having within itself elements that are Catholic and those that are Protestant, and belonging exclusively neither to the one nor to the other.

There is a most valuable "Appendix" of about forty pages, which contains all the most important deliverances on Church unity, or union, issued under the auspices of the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal Churches within the last twenty years or more.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*"This Way."* By R. W. Lewis, Evangelist National Book Company, Chattanooga, Tenn. Paper, Pp. 77.

This is a convenient handbook for Christian workers in dealing with seeking souls, in building up converts in the faith, and in stimulating Christians to become active in saving men. It approaches conversion from the revivalistic standpoint, which too often overlooks the normal growth through Christian nurture. The book

will be found useful by pastors in winning persons for the kingdom, and it might be placed with profit in the hands of the awakened and the doubter.

J. A. S.

*Realizing Religion.* By S. M. Shoemaker, Jr. Association Press, New York. Cloth, pp. 96. Price, \$0.90.

The Present Need of Religion, The Fact of Sin, What is Conversion, The Way Jesus Christ Helps, What Religion Ought to Do for Us, Driving Power for the New Life, Wanted—Witnesses, are the several topics under which the author presents personal religion in several aspects. The book is practical in aim, sound in its views and interesting in its manner of approach. It will be helpful to those groping after a vital religious experience.

J. A. S.

*The Ethiopic Didascalia.* By J. M. Harden, LL.D. The Macmillan Company, New York. Cloth. Pp. 204. Price, 95 cents net.

This belongs to Series IV of The Translations of Christian Literature, issued by the S. P. C. K. of London.

The Ethiopic Didascalia (Teaching) which has come down from early times is "a somewhat rambling discourse on Church life and society" in the fourth century. The Didascalia in forty-three chapters corresponds with the first seven chapters of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, a spurious work, which professes to be a deliverance of the Apostles themselves. Such works have no place in the canon of Scripture, but are not, therefore, to be regarded as useless. They reflect the general state and condition of the Church in the early centuries and shed light upon its beliefs and usages.

After a brief introduction, in which it is claimed that the work is a message to the Church from the Twelve Apostles assembled in Jerusalem, together with Paul and James the bishop of Jerusalem, it proceeds to deal with moral questions, laying special stress on the duty of studying the Scriptures, and of keeping one's self pure. Then follow chapters on the mutual duties of husband and wife; on the offices and duties of ministers; on the wickedness of taking part in heathen assemblies or of being present in theaters; on the family life; on martyrdom; on the observance of church festivals, and so forth.

It advocates an episcopal form of church government, enjoins infant baptism and the observance of the Lord's Day. There are many wholesome warnings and much sound advice; but on the whole it falls far short of the canonical books in language and content.

J. A. S.

#### SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

*Christianity in Its Modern Expression.* By George Burman Foster, late Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Chicago. Edited by Douglas Clyde Macintosh. The Macmillan Co. N. Y. 1921. Cloth. Pp. 294. Price \$3.75.

This is a posthumous work, Dr. Foster having died three years ago. The present volume embodies his lectures on the dogmatics and ethics of the Christian religion. It seems hardly worth while to give an extended review of a brilliant erratic book in which one finds such sentences as here follow. "This whole conception of an extra-historical being entering the human race is mythology pure and simple. Indeed, the old conception of the Trinity and of the deity of Christ is pure mythology." Paul's vision was only an hallucination. "Recognition of the Holy Spirit as a person other than the person of God is not warranted by Scripture." The author's view of the Trinity is old Sabellianism. We venture the assertion that a student for the ministry taught by Dr. Foster would be unfit to preach the Gospel, if for no other reason than there would be very little Gospel to preach.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

#### MISSIONS

*Training World Christians.* A Handbook in Missionary Education. By Gilbert Loveland. Cloth. Pp. 240. Price, \$1.25 net. Illustrated. The Methodist Book Concern, New York.

This is an excellent book on missions, making accessible a vast amount of information, statistical and otherwise, covering all lands. It also suggests various methods and courses of study, topics for discussion, and gives a bibliography at the end of each chapter. A perusal of

this book by the pastor and mission workers will increase their interest and add to their efficiency.

J. A. S.

#### SUNDAY SCHOOL

*A New Way to Solve Old Problems.* By Frank E. Duddy, Assistant Pastor and Director of Religious Education in the First Congregational Church, Toledo, Ohio. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Pp. 50. Cloth. 90 cents.

This booklet is an attempt to solve the problem of religious education through the Church. However, it treats only of the Sunday School. The gist of the book is that the Church with which the author is connected has risen to the true conception that a Sunday School is after all a *school* in which pedagogical methods must be applied by competent teachers. In this case the church engages available public school teachers to do the work and pays their salaries out of the church treasury. This is one good way, of course, but not the only way. It is evident that in substance this way must be applied to gain the true end. The Bible must be properly *taught*, which is too often not the case in many schools. We commend the book to pastors and superintendents.

J. A. S.

#### BIBLE STUDIES AND ARCHAEOLOGY

*The Geography of Bible Lands.* By Rena L. Crosby. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pp. 242. Price, \$1.75 net; postage extra.

This book is one of the Abingdon Religious Education Texts edited by Dr. David G. Downey, and of the Week-Day School Series, edited by George Herbert Betts. It comprises thirty-two lessons on the lands of the Bible, from Persia to Italy, written in a style adapted to pupils of the eighth school grade and upwards, and is profusely illustrated with the best pictures and maps. Many of the latter are from the magazine *Asia*. Each lesson is followed by questions for review. The work is well done.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

*The Pilgrim in Jerusalem.* By Rev. O. H. Parry, M.A., S.P.C.K., London. Pp. 135.

Though written by a clergyman, a devout lover of the history of Zion, this is an artist's book on Jerusalem. The author modestly says, "There is nothing new or original in this book, except the drawings." But there are twenty-four charming sketches and more than a hundred pages of carefully digested tradition and accurate description, making it, as the author hoped to, a reliable guide-book for the intelligent pilgrim. One who will have seen the sacred city with the aid of this handbook will know his Jerusalem; and no one can fully appreciate the book who has not seen it.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

*Short Egyptian Grammar.* By Prof. Dr. Günther Roeder. Translated from the German by Rev. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph.D., D.D. Yale University Press, New Haven. Pp. 144. Price \$2.50.

In line with their progressive policy the managers of the Yale University Press here publish first in America an adequate and at the same time elemental Egyptian grammar. In this field Roeder's book has long been the standard, while Dr. Mercer's translation is a monument to his own scholarship. The printing is from the press of Drugulin in Leipzig, which is a guaranty of typographical excellence.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

*King Alfred's Books.* By the Right Reverend Bishop G. F. Browne, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A. S.P.C.K., London. Pp. xxiii, 390. Price 30s. net.

Alfred "the Great" lived from 849 to 901 A. D. He was king of the West Saxons, 871-901. He is called also "Alfred the Deliverer." He delivered his people from the power of the Danes; he delivered them also from lawlessness and ignorance. He was himself a man of learning, though largely a self-tutored one, and he appreciated the value of vernacular literature. To this end he translated from the Latin six pieces which are known as King Alfred's Books. They are: (1) The Blooms from the Soliloquies of St. Augustine; (2) The Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great; (3) The History and Geography of Crocius; (4) The Pastoral Care of St. Gregory the Great; (5) Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the

English Race; (6) The Consolation of Philosophy, by Boethius. The translations were made not alone to make Anglo-Saxon literature but also to inculcate Christian morals. The good king sometimes finds it necessary to point the moral, so that his translation is not infrequently a commentary. A new study of this great work is here made by Bishop Browne.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

*The Prophetic Movement in Israel.* By Albert C. Knudson, Professor in Boston University School of Theology. The Methodist Book Concern, New York. Pp. 174. Price \$1.00.

The value of this book is to be estimated by neither its size nor its cost. The Methodist Book Concern is to be congratulated upon so successful an experiment in attacking the H. C. L. in books. By cutting down margins and binding in boards this book has been brought back to normal. It is one of a group of text-books intended primarily for the use of training classes of teachers or prospective teachers. For this purpose the material is admirably arranged, while for the general subject no one more capable than the author of "Beacon Lights of Prophecy" could have been chosen. In ten succinct chapters the whole movement of prophecy in Israel is reviewed. Prof. Knudson understands the religion of Israel too well to find its beginnings in the prophets of the eighth century B. C. "The eighth-century prophets were conscious of no sharp break with the past. They were not innovators. They felt themselves at one with Moses, Samuel, and Elijah. Furthermore it is evident from their writings that they must, in Emerson's words, 'have had a long foreground somewhere for such a start.' Their books presuppose centuries of reflection on the deep things of God. They were not 'shot out of a pistol;' they were the ripe fruitage of a growth whose roots can be traced back to the time of Moses." After a historic survey of the prophets their teachings are reviewed in the following chapters: Prophecy and the Nation, Prophecy and Morality, Prophecy and Personal Religious Experience, Prophecy and the World, Prophecy and the Future. If we have any adverse criticism of the book to make it is that Messianic Prophecy is not given the emphasis it deserves in view of its fulfillment. The same criticism is to be made of the author's "Religious

Teaching of the Old Testament." It is not what the author says, but rather what he leaves unsaid, to which we take exception.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

*"The Lutheran World Almanac and Annual Encyclopedia," for 1921.* Issued by the Lutheran Bureau of the National Lutheran Council, 437 Fifth Ave., New York. Compiled and edited by the Statistical and Year Book Committee of the National Lutheran Council: Rev. O. M. Norlie, Ph.D., Editor and Chairman, Rev. G. L. Kieffer, A.M., Associate Editor and Secretary, Rev. Ellis B. Burgess, D.D. and Rev. A. H. Dornbirer. Pp. 966, 6 x 9. Price, Paper \$1.50, Cloth \$2.00.

This is really a stupendous compilation of facts pertaining to the Lutheran Church throughout the world, and especially of America. We know of no other denominational exhibit equal to it. Every Lutheran pastor and every library in the land should have a copy of the present and succeeding issues.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Lincoln and Prohibition.* By Charles T. White, Political News Editor New York Tribune. Introduction by Will H. Hays, Postmaster General of the U. S. Portraits and Documents. The Abingdon Press, N. Y. Cloth . Pp. 233. Price \$2.00 net.

A curious feature of the Introduction is its lack of any reference whatever to Lincoln as a temperance advocate. Mr. White, however, clearly establishes the fact that Lincoln was a total abstainer, that he was a pledged abstainer and that he deplored the evils arising from intemperance. Among the several appendices, the first one is the most valuable, giving in 27 pages a "Chronology of the Anti-liquor movement in America."

J. A. SINGMASTER.



# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is a religious magazine owned and controlled by its editors. It is not, however, to be regarded as their personal organ, neither is it published for private profit but solely in the interests of the Church. It is always open to contributors regardless of denominational affiliation, but its chief purpose is to be the medium for the discussion of theological, religious, historical and social questions from the view-point of the Lutheran Church, especially that portion of it known as the General Synod.

The editors of the QUARTERLY stand firmly and uncompromisingly for the orthodox faith as confessed by the Lutheran Church, and never knowingly publish any article which attacks or discredits the fundamental doctrines or principles of the Christian religion. Within these limits they regard the QUARTERLY as a forum for courteous and scholarly discussion. Without such liberty the truth in its many phases can not be developed.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors who are amenable to the discipline of the Church alone. Neither does the publication of an article mean that they endorse all the views which it presents. Should any of the contributors fall into serious error, or present false and dangerous views, they may and usually will be corrected in subsequent issues by the editors, or by others.

The editors believe that on this basis the QUARTERLY will commend itself to its readers and to all intelligent and thoughtful Lutheran ministers and laymen who are cordially invited to become subscribers.

# The Common Service Book

The Official Service and Hymnal of the  
United Lutheran Church.

## Contents:

Calendar  
The Service  
Matins  
Vespers  
Lessons, etc.  
Prayers  
The Psalms  
The Canticles  
History of the Passion  
The New Occasional Services  
General Rubrics  
The Small Catechism  
The Hymnal

The book contains a wealth of Liturgical and Hymnological  
material

Unity and Uniformity in the United Lutheran Church will be  
assured with the general use of this book

## Three Editions

Words, (Small) price \$1.15 to \$5.00 according to binding.

Words, (Large) Standard Text edition. Price \$1.35 to \$4.00  
according to binding.

Music Edition Contains music for the liturgy and for all the  
hymns of the official collection. \$2.00 up ac-  
cording to binding.

## THE UNITED LUTHERAN PUBLICATION HOUSE

S. E. COR. NINTH AND SANSON STREETS,  
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Southern Headquarters 437 Fifth Ave. 359 W. State St. 212 Ninth St.  
Columbia, S. C. New York Chicago Pittsburgh

✓ JH  
m.c.  
H.H.

51

